

GLOBAL STABILITY FOR CHARGE-SCALAR FIELDS ON MINKOWSKI SPACE

HANS LINDBLAD AND JACOB STERBENZ

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SAN DIEGO

ABSTRACT. We prove that the charge-scalar field equations are globally stable on $(3+1)$ dimensional Minkowski space for small initial data in certain gauge covariant weighted Sobolev spaces. These spaces can be chosen to be almost scale invariant with respect to the homogeneity of the equations, and our result is valid for initial data with non-zero charge that is also non-stationary at space-like infinity. The method of proof is a tensor-geometric approach which is based on a sharp family of weighted bilinear L^2 space-time estimates.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we study the global in time behavior of small amplitude classical solutions to the massless Charge-Scalar-Field equations (CSF) equations on Minkowski space. These are also sometimes referred to in the literature as Maxwell-Higgs or the Maxwell-Klein-Gordon equations. They are constructed as follows: We let $\mathcal{M}$ denote the $(3+1)$ dimensional Minkowski space with metric $g = (-1, 1, 1, 1)$ and compatible Levi-Civita connection which we refer to here as ∇ . Then let:

$$V = \mathcal{M} \times \mathbb{C} ,$$

denote a complex line bundle over $\mathcal{M}$ with hermitian inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_V$ and compatible connection D . That is, one has the formula:

$$(1.1) \quad X \langle \psi, \phi \rangle_V = \langle D_X \psi, \phi \rangle_V + \langle \psi, D_X \phi \rangle_V ,$$

for vector-fields X on $\mathcal{M}$. The connection D can be extended in a natural way to sections of the tensor bundle $V \otimes T_l^k \mathcal{M}$ of complex valued tensors of type (k, l) on Minkowski space such that one has the Leibnitz rule:

$$D_X(\phi \otimes T) = D_X(\phi) \otimes T + \phi \otimes \nabla_X T .$$

In this setup, we call a section ϕ of V a *complex scalar field* if it satisfies the equation:

$$(1.2) \quad \square^{\mathbb{C}} \phi = D^\alpha D_\alpha \phi = 0 ,$$

where $D^2 \phi$ is the covariant Hessian of ϕ , which is computed regarding $D\phi$ as a complex valued one-form on $\mathcal{M}$. Since V is globally trivial, we can let $\mathbf{1}_V$ denote a unit normalized global section. That is one has $\langle \mathbf{1}_V, \mathbf{1}_V \rangle \equiv 1$. Such a choice is referred to as a *gauge*. In terms of this, any section ϕ to V can be identified with a complex valued function on $\mathcal{M}$ where we abusively write $\phi = \phi \mathbf{1}_V$. This allows us to define complex conjugation $\bar{\phi}$ as one would for ordinary complex numbers. We

will use this operation to define a symmetric and symplectic inner product on V as follows:

$$\Re\langle\phi, \bar{\psi}\rangle_V = \frac{1}{2}(\phi\bar{\psi} + \bar{\phi}\psi) , \quad \Im\langle\phi, \bar{\psi}\rangle_V = \frac{1}{2}(\phi\bar{\psi} - \bar{\phi}\psi) .$$

Also, with respect to this frame for V , and for any frame $\{e_\alpha\}$ on $\mathcal{M}$, we define the connection one-form $\{A_\alpha\}$ via the relations:

$$(1.3) \quad D_\alpha \mathbf{1}_V = \sqrt{-1}A_\alpha .$$

Notice that the compatibility condition (1.1) immediately implies that the $\{A_\alpha\}$ are real. Using this notation, the covariant derivative of any complex valued tensor T with respect to a vector-field X in $\mathcal{M}$ can be written as:

$$(1.4) \quad D_X T = \nabla_X(T) + \sqrt{-1}A(X) \cdot T .$$

Of course, the choice of $\mathbf{1}_V$ and hence representation of D_X is somewhat arbitrary because one can always perform a local (or global) unitary transformation of it. If we let $\mathbf{1}_V \rightsquigarrow \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_V$ denote the transformation given by $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_V = e^{-i\chi}\mathbf{1}_V$, where χ is some real valued function on $\mathcal{M}$, then (1.4) shows that the potentials $\{A_\alpha\}$ transform as:

$$\tilde{A}_\alpha = A_\alpha - e_\alpha(\chi) .$$

Now it turns out that this ambiguity which is inherent to the equation (1.4) does *not* need to be resolved in order to proceed with a detailed analysis of the scalar field equation (1.2). This is because the connection (1.1) has a basic geometric invariant on which it is possible to base literally all analysis of (1.2) so long as one is content to define all analytic objects of interest in terms of geometric quantities. This is the approach we shall take here. The basic geometric invariant is, of course, the curvature of the connection D which arises from the operation of commuting covariant differentiation. Specifically, there exists a (real) two-form F on $\mathcal{M}$, such that for any two vector-fields X, Y we have the relation:

$$(1.5) \quad D_X D_Y \phi - D_Y D_X \phi - D_{[X, Y]} \phi = \sqrt{-1}F(X, Y) \cdot \phi .$$

In terms of the frame $\{e_\alpha\}$ we can simply write:

$$(1.6) \quad D_\alpha D_\beta \phi - D_\beta D_\alpha \phi = \sqrt{-1}F_{\alpha\beta} \cdot \phi .$$

Here $D_\alpha D_\beta \phi$ denotes the (α, β) component of the Hessian $D^2\phi$ and should not be confused with the repeated directional covariant differentiation $D_{e_\alpha} D_{e_\beta} \phi$. To see the difference, a short computation of (1.5) in the frame $\{e_\alpha\}$ shows that one has the identity:

$$D_{e_\alpha} D_{e_\beta} \phi - D_{e_\beta} D_{e_\alpha} \phi - D_{[e_\alpha, e_\beta]} \phi = \sqrt{-1}(e_\alpha(A_\beta) - e_\beta(A_\alpha) - c_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma A_\gamma) \cdot \phi ,$$

where $[e_\alpha, e_\beta] = c_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma e_\gamma$ are the structure ‘‘constants’’ of the frame $\{e_\alpha\}$. In terms of the indexed version (1.6), using (1.4) this last line reads:

$$D_\alpha D_\beta \phi - D_\beta D_\alpha \phi = \sqrt{-1}(\nabla_\alpha A_\beta - \nabla_\beta A_\alpha) \cdot \phi ,$$

Either way, this gives the well known ‘‘Bianchi identity’’:

$$(1.7) \quad F = dA .$$

To define the full CSF system, we now couple the complex scalar field ϕ to the curvature of the connection D in such a way that one ends up with a Lagrangian

field theory. For an intuitive approach to how this is done, we consider F as a solution to Maxwell's equations. Because F satisfies the Bianchi identity (1.7), we have that:

$$(1.8a) \quad \nabla^\beta F_{\alpha\beta} = J_\alpha ,$$

$$(1.8b) \quad \nabla^\beta {}^*F_{\alpha\beta} = 0 ,$$

for some one-form J which obeys the rule $\nabla^\alpha J_\alpha = 0$. In the above formulae *F denotes the Hodge dual of F which is given by the expression ${}^*F_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\gamma\delta} F_{\gamma\delta}$. Here $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ denotes the volume form on Minkowski space. As usual, we use this duality operation and contraction along the time-like vector-field ∂_t to define the electric and magnetic field strengths:

$$(1.9) \quad E_i = F_{0i} , \quad H_i = {}^*F_{0i} .$$

Using these quantities, the system (1.8) takes the following familiar form which will be of use in the sequel:

$$(1.10a) \quad \partial_t E - \nabla_x \times H = \underline{J} , \quad (\text{div})E = J_0 ,$$

$$(1.10b) \quad \partial_t H + \nabla_x \times E = 0 , \quad (\text{div})H = 0 .$$

Here $\nabla_x \times = \epsilon_i{}^{jk} \partial_j$ is the usual curl operation, and $\underline{J}$ denotes the spatial part of the current vector J . We note here that this latter form of the equations will be particularly useful when dealing with questions concerning the initial data of Lie derivatives of $F_{\alpha\beta}$. In general it is the more natural language with which to discuss the initial value problem for the system (1.8).

For the Maxwell field F , there is an energy-momentum tensor $Q[F]$ which is given by:

$$(1.11) \quad Q_{\alpha\beta}[F] = \frac{1}{2} \left(F_{\alpha\gamma} F_\beta{}^\gamma + {}^*F_{\alpha\gamma} {}^*F_\beta{}^\gamma \right) = F_{\alpha\gamma} F_\beta{}^\gamma - \frac{1}{4} g_{\alpha\beta} F_{\gamma\delta} F^{\gamma\delta} .$$

A brief calculation using the identities (1.8a)–(1.8b) shows that one has the divergence identity:

$$(1.12) \quad \nabla^\alpha Q_{\alpha\beta}[F] = - F_{\beta\gamma} J^\gamma .$$

Furthermore, the complex scalar field (1.2) also has an energy-momentum tensor which is analogous to the usual energy-momentum tensor of the (non-covariant) D'Lambertian. This is given by:

$$(1.13) \quad Q_{\alpha\beta}[\phi] = \Re(D_\alpha \phi \overline{D_\beta \phi}) - \frac{1}{2} g_{\alpha\beta} D^\gamma \phi \overline{D_\gamma \phi} .$$

A direct application of the field equation (1.2), the compatibility condition (1.1), and the commutator identity (1.5) shows that one has the divergence law:

$$(1.14) \quad \nabla^\alpha Q_{\alpha\beta}[\phi] = F_{\beta\gamma} \Im(\phi \overline{D^\gamma \phi}) .$$

Notice that this formula does not contain any explicit reference to the connection coefficients (1.3). This is because it is a purely tensorial identity, and in particular does not depend on a choice of coordinates or frame.

The natural choice of coupling F to ϕ now comes if we simply stipulate that the current vector on the right hand side of (1.8a) be given by $J_\alpha = \Im(\phi \overline{D_\alpha \phi})$. With

this extra condition satisfied, the total energy momentum tensor $Q = Q[F] + Q[\phi]$ becomes divergence free:

$$(1.15) \quad \nabla^\alpha Q_{\alpha\beta} = 0 .$$

Notice that this coupling is legitimate because as an immediate consequence of the equation (1.2) one has that this choice of current vector J_α satisfies the continuity equation:

$$(1.16) \quad \nabla^\alpha J_\alpha = 0 ,$$

which is the only prerequisite for a vector J to show up as the right hand side of the Maxwell equation (1.8a). We write the resulting system of equations, which we henceforth refer to as the CSF equations, together as:

$$(1.17a) \quad \nabla^\beta F_{\alpha\beta} = \Im(\phi \overline{D_\alpha \phi}) ,$$

$$(1.17b) \quad \square^{\mathbb{C}} \phi = 0 .$$

We note here that implicit in the system (1.17) is the Bianchi identity (1.7) or (1.8b). This is because we are assuming a-priori that F is the curvature of the connection which gives rise to $\square^{\mathbb{C}}$.

In this work we study the global in time Cauchy problem for the system (1.17). Since we have stated the equations in such a way as to deemphasize a choice of gauge, this deserves some explanation. Because we are interested in an evolution problem, we are reduced to a discussing the notion of gauge covariant initial data. To specify these, we first let $\underline{D}$ denote a connection on the initial time slice bundle $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{C}$. Since this is embedded as a hyper-surface in the original bundle $\mathcal{M} \times \mathbb{C} = V$, we will also specify the initial normal derivative D_t . The initial data for the system (1.17) can then be written in the form:

$$(1.18a) \quad F_{0i}(0) = E_i , \quad {}^*F_{0i}(0) = H_i ,$$

$$(1.18b) \quad \phi(0) = \phi_0 , \quad D_t \phi(0) = \dot{\phi}_0 .$$

In the above notation, we have used the labels (E, H) to denote quantities which only depend on $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$. These should not be confused with the space-time (E, H) used in the formulas (1.10). Now, from the form of the system (1.17) it is easy to see that this initial data cannot be specified freely. It must also satisfy the compatibility conditions:

$$(1.19) \quad \nabla^i E_i = \Im(\phi_0 \overline{\dot{\phi}_0}) , \quad \nabla^i H_i = 0 .$$

We will call a data set $(E, H, \phi_0, \dot{\phi}_0)$ which satisfies (1.19) *admissible*. The question we will be concerned with here is to describe in as detailed a way as possible the global in time behavior of solutions to the CSF equations whose initial data satisfies certain natural smallness assumptions. As usual, these will be stated in terms of regularity. In general, we define the covariant and gauge covariant weighted Sobolev spaces:

$$(1.20) \quad \|T\|_{H^{k,s_0}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 = \sum_{|I| \leq k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (1+r^2)^{s_0+|I|} |\nabla_x^I T|^2 dx ,$$

$$(1.21) \quad \|\psi\|_{H^{k,s_0}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 = \sum_{|I| \leq k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (1+r^2)^{s_0+|I|} |\underline{D}^I \psi|^2 dx .$$

Here I denotes the usual multiindex notation, while ∇_x denotes the restriction of the Levi-Civita connection ∇ to the time slice $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^3$. T denotes an arbitrary tensor. We will consider the Cauchy problem for admissible initial data sets which are in these function spaces for various values of s_0 and k .

Now, a basic regularity theorem for the system (1.17) says that if the norms (1.20)–(1.21) applied to (admissible) $(E, H, \phi_0, \dot{\phi}_0)$ are finite for certain values of s_0 and k , then a global solution to this system exists. In fact, there is no need to impose any of the weights $(1+r^2)$, and almost no smoothness is needed to make the argument work. This is the content of the fundamental regularity result of Eardly-Moncrief [5]–[6], and its later significant refinement due to Klainerman-Machedon [9]. While these results in some sense give the strongest possible global existence result one could hope to ask for, they contain surprising little information as to the nature of the global solution they obtain. In fact, the only information they provide is that the unweighted Sobolev H^s norm of the solution remains bounded for all time. No practical bounds for this quantity are obtained for $1 < s$. Furthermore, these results provide no information on the profile of the solution, even assuming that the initial data is localized at time $t = 0$ in a way that is consistent with the norms (1.20)–(1.21). Finally, these results do not lend themselves to a discussion of the asymptotic behavior of the scalar field ϕ in the sense of L^2 scattering. For example, there is no doubt that this involves long range corrections¹ due to the asymptotic behavior of the electro-magnetic field $F_{\alpha\beta}$, but the large data results just mentioned provide no information as to what form these corrections should take.

The result we present here is a first attempt to fill in some of the gap in understanding the asymptotic behavior of solutions to the system (1.17), at least for initial data with small (1.20)–(1.21) norms where the specific values of s_0 and k are to be specified. The method we employ is a new variant of the tensorial-geometric approach of Christodoulou-Klainerman [3]–[4] which also uses in a crucial way the space-time energy estimate approach appearing in the recent work of Lindblad-Rodnianski [12]. This will be applied to both the electro-magnetic field (1.8) and to the scalar field (1.2) through a novel geometric adaptation of a set of fundamental estimates which goes back to work of Morawetz [13]. The approach we follow also borrows ideas from previous works on the low regularity behavior of systems of semilinear wave equations, notably [9], in that we make crucial use of a certain family of sharp weighted bilinear L^2 space-time estimates for tensorial contractions to control error terms which come up in our analysis. Some of these estimates are proved through the use of a weighted $L^2(L^\infty)$ “Strichartz” type estimate which holds for certain null-components in a tensorial setting.

¹We will not discuss these corrections here, although they are implicit in the gauge-covariant approach we use. We believe the analysis we present goes a long way towards constructing and estimating the effect of long range corrections in the system (1.17), which should take the form of phase corrections which depend only in the charge. Also, we note here that the existence of long range corrections to the CSF equations is consistent with what is known for the Maxwell-Dirac system (see [7]) which is similar.

There has been previous work in general² on the global asymptotic behavior of the equations (1.17). This is the paper of Shu [15]. That program, while similar in spirit to ours, was not carried out in detail and was only aimed at resolving the case of solutions which are trivial outside of a fixed forward cone.³ It should be noted that we have found no way of closing our argument without making crucial use of space-time $L^2(L^\infty)$ estimates which serve to eliminate certain logarithmic divergences one would encounter when trying to pursue an L^∞ approach. As far as we can see, these types of estimates are necessary even if one assumes compact support for the initial data (modulo charge). There is no discussion of space-time norms in the work [15], or any other mechanism which would allow one to circumvent divergences arising in the purely L^∞ and energy estimates approach taken there. However, we would like to call the readers attention to the fact that the work [15] represents in many ways the approach we will take here. In particular, some of the more interesting features of the CSF nonlinearity were first discovered there, notably the beautiful cancelation which we use in (a slightly different form on) line (9.11) below.

Finally, we also mention the work of Psarrelli [14] on the asymptotic behavior for the equations (1.17) with a non-zero mass. This work again assumes compact support of the initial data, and is ultimately very different from what we do here because the version of (1.2) with non-zero mass enjoys a quite different decay estimate than its massless counterpart. It would be an interesting and non-trivial problem to extend the work of [14] to the case of fields which are non-stationary at space-like infinity, and it is not clear if our method is a step in this direction because of our persistent use of estimates derived from conformal invariance.

Before moving on the statement of our main result, it is worth mentioning at a heuristic level two of the most difficult features of attempting a purely physical-space analysis of the equations (1.17). We hope this gives the reader a bit of insight into why certain things are necessary. The first problem has to do with attempting to make use of the so called “null-condition” inherent in the system (1.17). Unlike other semilinear geometric wave equations, for example the wave-maps [17], there is not a direct correspondence between the semilinear model equations studied in [8] and [1] which satisfy the null condition directly, and the equations of gauge field theory.

There are basically two known ways the null condition for the equations (1.17) can be uncovered and utilized. The first is through the use of an elliptic gauge, as

²“General” meaning the system (1.17) with or without charge. There is also the previous work of Christodoulou–Choquet-Bruhat ([2]) which uses conformal compactification. However, this type of procedure requires more decay of the initial data and does not allow for either charge or dipole moments.

³While it is usually the case with scalar wave equations that once one can prove global existence using weighted energies for compactly supported initial data, one can move to non-compactly supported initial data by simply adding enough weights (at space-like infinity), for tensorial equations of the type (1.17) it is *not* possible to directly pass from the assumption of compactly supported initial data to the case of initial data with infinite support. This problem persists *even* if one assumes that the initial data decays at a very fast polynomial rate. The reason is not entirely obvious at first, and is due to subtle interaction between the scaling and tensorial properties of the equations (1.17). This will be explained in a moment.

in the works on the low regularity properties of this and other related systems [9]–[10]. This type of procedure leads to non-local versions of the null-forms studied in [8] and [1] which also have entirely different scaling properties than their non-local versions. To analyze the system of equations which arise in this way by using the inhomogeneous algebra (2.28) is quite awkward, and it is not even clear that this can even be done correctly. For example, the commutator of the weighted derivatives in (2.28) with Riesz potentials seems to cause enough of a problem that it effectively negates the savings one gets from the standard null-forms. Furthermore, any such analysis would have to somehow take into account the long range corrections the system (1.17) must undergo due to the lack of decay of the electro-magnetic field (1.8). These corrections are clearly a gauge dependent phenomena, and it does not seem that the usual elliptic gauge is most convenient for writing them down.

The second way the null condition for the CSF system can be uncovered is directly through its tensorial structure. That is, the null condition makes itself evident through the contraction structure of error terms which arise after commuting the equations with geometrically defined operations of differentiation. To be useful, the geometric differentiation must take the form of Lie differentiation of the Maxwell field and gauge covariant differentiation of the scalar field. Because the resulting error terms then involve contractions over all possible indices, they can be expanded in a frame which takes into account the null geometry of Minkowski space. In this way, one immediately sees that two “bad components” can never interact with each other. However, since the system (1.17) involves the interaction of two different types of quantities, namely a two form and a scalar field, it is not entirely clear at first that this type of tensorial structure will cause enough “good interactions” to take place, or even what the “components” of the scalar field should be. Fortunately for us, the CSF equations do contain a deep underlying structure which allows one to treat *both* quantities, $F_{\alpha\beta}$ and ϕ , as a single instance of a master “tensorial” object. What’s more, one can produce a single family of bilinear estimates for this “tensor” which covers all possible error terms that can be generated by differentiating the system (1.17). This type of underlying unity goes well beyond the scalar null structure of [8] and [1], and is akin to what one sees for the pure Yang-Mills and the Einstein equations (see [16]–[4]).

The second main difficulty we need to overcome in our analysis is a consequence of an interesting interplay between the scaling and decay properties of solutions to the system (1.17). While in $(3 + 1)$ dimensions these equations are *subcritical* with respect to the translation invariant conserved energy⁴, which ultimately is responsible for large data regularity as mentioned previously, these equations are in general *critical*⁵ with respect to decay at space-like infinity. To better understand this, consider a linear wave equation of the form:

$$(1.22) \quad \square \phi = -2\sqrt{-1} A^\alpha \partial_\alpha \phi,$$

⁴The conserved energy is a simple consequence of the tensorial conservation law (1.15) and the fact that ∂_t is a Killing field on Minkowski space. This conserved quantity is at the level of the $\dot{H}^1$ norm of ϕ .

⁵This should really be called “charge critical”. The conservation of charge for these equations, which can be written as $q = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Im(\phi \bar{D}_t \phi) \equiv \text{const.}$, takes place at exactly the critical regularity which is the $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ norm of ϕ .

where $\square = \partial^\alpha \partial_\alpha$ denotes the usual D’Lambertian on Minkowski space. This can be seen as a model for the equation (1.2) where we have fixed a gauge (which gauge does not matter for the sake of this discussion). Now, assume that the initial data for (1.22) decays like r^{-m} as $r \rightarrow \infty$. The question we then ask is how much decay should one then expect from the potentials A_α in order to guarantee that the solution keeps this decay in the far exterior region $2t < r$ (which should be the simplest to control!). By homogeneity, one expects that if A_α decays like r^{-l} for $2t < r$, then the solution ϕ will decay like r^{-m-l+1} (integrate the second order equation twice).⁶

One immediately sees from this simple analysis that to control things A_α must decay at least as well as r^{-1} in the far exterior, and that for this critical rate of decay some work is required to avoid logarithmic divergences in the “error” term on the right hand side of (1.22). This decay rate r^{-1} is not a coincidence, but rather a consequence of the fact that the equation (1.22) scales like $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ at the level of initial data, for which one sees that r^{-1} is precisely the critical rate of decay. What’s more, the entire system (1.17) scales like $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ at the level of the potentials A_α , and because of the tensorial nature of the CSF equations at least some of the potentials *must* in general decay no better than r^{-1} . This is a simple effect of the elliptic constraint equation:

$$(1.23) \quad \nabla^i E_i = \Im(\phi \overline{D_t \phi}) .$$

Introducing a potential function φ for the curl-free part E^{cf} , we see that unless one has:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Im(\phi \overline{D_t \phi}) \equiv 0 ,$$

it will be the case that $\varphi \sim \frac{1}{r}$. Since this potential function must show up somewhere in field potentials A_α regardless of the gauge, we see that in general an equation of the form (1.22), and hence (1.2), will be critical for decay at space-like infinity.

To combat this critical rate of decay, one must prove sharp space-time estimates in order to have an effective strategy. There will in general be no extra “convergence factors” with which one can use to integrate over large time intervals. In practice, this means that all of our space-time estimates need to be proved in a-priori (divergence) form. This kind of difficulty should be understood in contrast to other field equations, such as the Einstein equations. In $(3+1)$ dimensions the long range effect of the mass for this latter system leaves plenty of room with respect to the scaling properties of the equations (see for example [12]). Therefore, from the point of view of decay, the Einstein equations are somewhat more forgiving and do not require estimates which are as precise as what we need to make things work here (see for example [12]).

We are now ready to state our main result:

⁶For smooth A_α this heuristic can be made precise through an easy use of weighted exterior energy estimates.

Theorem 1.1 (Global Stability of CSF Equations). *Let $2 \leq k$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $s_0 = s + \gamma$ be given such that $s_0 < \frac{3}{2}$, $0 < \gamma$, and $\frac{1}{2} < s$. Let $(E, H, \phi_0, \dot{\phi}_0)$ be an admissible initial data set, and define the charge to be the value:*

$$(1.24) \quad q = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Im(\phi_0 \overline{\dot{\phi}_0}) .$$

Then there exists a universal constant $\mathcal{E}_{k,s,\gamma}$, which depends only on the parameters k, s, γ , such that if $(E, H, \phi_0, \dot{\phi}_0)$ is an admissible initial data set which satisfies the smallness condition:

$$(1.25) \quad \|E^{df}\|_{H^{k,s_0}(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|H\|_{H^{k,s_0}(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|\underline{D}\phi_0\|_{H^{k,s_0}(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|\dot{\phi}_0\|_{H^{k,s_0}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \mathcal{E}_{k,s,\gamma} ,$$

where $E = E^{df} + E^{cf}$ is the Hodge decomposition of E into its divergence free and curl free components (resp.), then there exists a (unique) global solution to the system of equations (1.17) with this initial data set such that if $\{L, \underline{L}, e_A\}$ denotes a standard spherical null frame (see (2.18) and (2.19) below), then the following point-wise properties of this solution holds:

$$(1.26a) \quad |\alpha| \lesssim \mathcal{E}_{k,s,\gamma} \cdot \tau_+^{-s-\frac{3}{2}} \cdot (w)_\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}} , \quad |\underline{\alpha}| \lesssim \mathcal{E}_{k,s,\gamma} \cdot \tau_+^{-1} \tau_-^{-s-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (w)_\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}} ,$$

$$(1.26b) \quad |\rho| \lesssim q \cdot r^{-2} \chi_{1 < t < r} + \mathcal{E}_{k,s,\gamma} \cdot \tau_+^{-1-s} \tau_-^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (w)_\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}} ,$$

$$(1.26c) \quad |\sigma| \lesssim \mathcal{E}_{k,s,\gamma} \cdot \tau_+^{-1-s} \tau_-^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (w)_\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}} ,$$

and:

$$(1.27a) \quad |\tilde{D}_L \phi| \lesssim \mathcal{E}_{k,s,\gamma} \cdot \tau_+^{-s-\frac{3}{2}} \cdot (w)_\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}} , \quad |D \underline{L} \phi| \lesssim \mathcal{E}_{k,s,\gamma} \cdot \tau_+^{-1} \tau_-^{-s-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (w)_\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}} ,$$

$$(1.27b) \quad |\mathcal{D} \phi| \lesssim \mathcal{E}_{k,s,\gamma} \cdot \tau_+^{-1-s} \tau_-^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (w)_\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}} , \quad |\phi| \lesssim \mathcal{E}_{k,s,\gamma} \cdot \tau_+^{-1} \tau_-^{-s+\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (w)_\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}} .$$

Here we have set:

$$|\tilde{D}_L \phi|^2 = \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right|^2 \chi_{1 < t < 2r} + |D_L \phi|^2 \chi_{r < \frac{1}{2}t} , \quad |\mathcal{D} \phi|^2 = \delta^{AB} D_A \phi \overline{D_B \phi} ,$$

and $\underline{D}$ denotes the spatial part of the connection D . Also, $(\alpha, \underline{\alpha}, \rho, \sigma)$ denotes the components of the null decomposition (2.23) of $F_{\alpha\beta}$. Finally, the weight functions $\tau_\pm$ and w_γ are defined via the formulas:

$$\tau_+^2 = 1 + (t+r)^2 , \quad \tau_-^2 = 1 + (t-r)^2 , \quad w_\gamma = \tau_-^{2\gamma} \chi_{t < r} .$$

Remark 1.2. In the course of our proof of Theorem 1.1, we will also show decay (peeling) properties similar to (1.26)–(1.27) for the higher derivatives of (F, ϕ) assuming that $2 < k$. We have not stated this formally for the sake of brevity.

Remark 1.3. Note the first term in the decay asymptotic for ρ on line (1.26b) above. As $r \rightarrow \infty$ on any given time slice $t = \text{const.}$ this portion of the electro-magnetic field decays only like r^{-2} . This is the long range effect of the electro-static equation

(1.23). What is somewhat surprising is that this long range effect *only* propagates in the exterior of the forward cone $t = r$. That is, after rescaling at infinity, the effect of the charge is discontinuous across this cone. This fact goes a long way towards explaining why it is so much easier to deal with the case of compactly supported initial data. Also, notice that in the case where the value (1.24) vanishes, this long range effect is eliminated. This, of course, is the main reason why the assumption of zero charge is amenable to other techniques, e.g. conformal compactification.

Remark 1.4. Note that we can allow any value $s_0 < \frac{3}{2}$ of the weight factor in the norms (1.20)–(1.21) applied to the initial data so long as it is bigger than the scale invariant factor of $\frac{1}{2}$. At this value, the norms become homogeneous (except for the extra term of 1 in the physical space weight) with respect to the scaling properties of the equations (1.17). It is also at this point that essentially all of our estimates break down due to logarithmic divergences. Also, for values of $s_0 < 1$, note that our condition on the initial data (1.25) requires much less decay than previous works based on weighted energies, e.g. the classical results in [8] for semilinear equations.⁷ Thus, our main theorem falls just short of a scale invariant result, and can be considered a “low regularity” theorem with respect to physical space decay. Finally, we should mention that below the level of the scaling (i.e. $s_0 < \frac{1}{2}$), there is no reason for the type of analysis we do here to make sense. In fact, even the simple notion of the charge (1.24) cannot be defined in this case because this level of decay is consistent with the asymptotics $\phi_0 \sim r^{-1+\delta}$ and $\dot{\phi}_0 \sim r^{-2+\delta}$ for some $0 < \delta$, which lead to a divergence in (1.24).

1.1. A brief outline of the work. We give here a very quick overview of the paper. In the next section, we make a list of some more or less standard geometric formulas relating to tensors and complex line bundles, as well as to the geometric structure of Minkowski space. This section is probably best left as a reference, and can be avoided by the reader with a passing acquaintance of this material.

In the third section, we build a series of weighted L^2 estimates for electro-magnetic fields. This material is for the most part a straight-forward adaptation of the standard material found in [3], with some new technical devices which are crucial for the approach we take in this paper. These are: A fractionally weighted version of the usual Morawetz type estimate for null-decomposed electro-magnetic fields, the decomposition of an electro-magnetic field into its pure charge and charge free components, and fixed time, characteristic, and space-time estimates which respect this decomposition. These estimates are proved with the help of a certain weighted elliptic estimate which we demonstrate in the appendix.

In the fourth section, we set about proving analogs of the estimates of the third section for complex scalar fields. This involves an interesting new proof of the classical Morawetz energy decay estimates for scalar fields which is directly based on the conformal geometry of Minkowski space. With some work, this leads to a set of estimates which are virtually identical with what is available for electro-magnetic fields. This device is important for what we do here because it allows us to treat

⁷For instance, we take the gradient $\underline{D}\phi$ first before applying the weighted L^2 norm.

the curvature and the (conjugated gradient) scalar field on the same footing.

In the fifth and sixth sections, we prove L^∞ type estimates for the electromagnetic and complex scalar fields. Interestingly enough, these involve in a crucial way the space-time, fixed time, as well as characteristic energy estimates developed in the preceding two sections.

In the seventh section, we recast all of the estimates we prove in this paper in a uniform form. First we introduce an auxiliary “tensor” which has the behavior of the electro-magnetic-complex-scalar field which we are studying. We then prove a series of weighted L^2 bilinear estimates for interactions of various components of this “tensor”. It turns out that all of the estimates we need to control the error terms of the sequel can be put in a single form, which we call the abstract parity estimate. This is proved at the end of this section through a simple case analysis.

In the final two sections of the paper, we prove error estimates for the commutators of the field equations (1.17) with certain Lie derivatives. With the work developed in the previous sections, this turns out to be quite easy because everything is just a special case of the abstract parity estimate of section seven.

Finally, in an appendix we prove certain Sobolev type estimates which are used in the main work. This material is included for the sake of completeness and can simply be referred to by the reader who wants more detailed account of certain (standard) calculations we use.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Sergiu Klainerman and Igor Rodnianski who played a large role in initiating and supporting this project. This investigation originated from a conversation with those two as to whether one could extend the low regularity approach of [9] to discuss the scattering behavior of the CSF system (1.17). It was S. Klainerman’s insistence that one should first “do it classically” in order to get a feel for the bulk behavior of the field quantities, and to see if anything interesting turns up, that lead to our study. The possibility that one could use space-time estimates to eliminate logarithmic divergences coming from the charge was first pointed out to us by I. Rodnianski. This plays a crucial role in our work. We would also like to thank him for mentioning the connection with conformal geometry that a previous proof of the divergence identities (4.9)–(4.10) had. We have used this elegant description in Section 4.

Part of this work was done while we were Members of the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton. H.L. was supported by the NSF grant DMS-0111298 to the Institute and partially supported by the the NSF Grant DMS-0200226. J.S. was supported by a Veblin Research Instructorship and an NSF postdoctoral fellowship.

2. SOME GEOMETRIC PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we introduce the basic geometric concepts and identities which we will use in our analysis of the field equations (1.17). All of this material is completely standard, and we review it here in detail solely for the convenience of the

reader. Experienced readers will find it worthwhile to skip this section and simply refer to it at places in the sequel where a specific calculation requires one of the identities we list here.

2.1. Lie Derivatives. We begin with some well known formulas involving Lie derivatives and divergences of vector-fields and differential forms. For any sections X, Y to $T\mathcal{M}$ we have the usual formula $\mathcal{L}_X Y = [X, Y]$. We also denote by $\mathcal{L}_X \omega$ and $\mathcal{L}_X F$ the Lie derivative of a one-form and two-form respectively. In the frame $\{e_\alpha\}$ these can be computed as:

$$(2.1a) \quad (\mathcal{L}_X \omega)_\alpha = X(\omega_\alpha) - \omega([X, e_\alpha]) ,$$

$$(2.1b) \quad (\mathcal{L}_X F)_{\alpha\beta} = X(F_{\alpha\beta}) - F([X, e_\alpha], e_\beta) - F(e_\alpha, [X, e_\beta]) .$$

For vector-fields X , we form the Lorentzian divergence:

$$(2.2) \quad (\text{div})X = \nabla_\alpha X^\alpha = (\text{trace})\nabla X .$$

Also, for each vector-field X on $\mathcal{M}$, we measure the effect of its flow on the Minkowski metric by forming its Lorentzian deformation tensor:

$$(2.3) \quad \mathcal{L}_X g = {}^{(X)}\pi .$$

By Lie differentiating the contraction $g_{\alpha\beta} = g^{\gamma\delta} g_{\gamma\alpha} g_{\delta\beta}$ we have that:

$$(2.4) \quad (\mathcal{L}_X g^\dagger)^{\alpha\beta} = -{}^{(X)}\pi^{\alpha\beta} ,$$

where we have set $g^\dagger = g^{\alpha\beta}$. Using this formula, one can easily compute the commutator of the Lie derivative $\mathcal{L}_X$ and the duality operator $*$ applied to a two-form:

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} [\mathcal{L}_X, *] F_{\alpha\beta} &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_X (\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} g^{\gamma\mu} g^{\delta\nu}) F_{\mu\nu} , \\ &= -\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}{}^\delta {}^{(X)}\pi^{\gamma\sigma} F_{\sigma\delta} + ((\text{div})X) * F_{\alpha\beta} . \end{aligned}$$

Now, a well known calculation shows that we have:

$$(2.6) \quad {}^{(X)}\pi = 2(\text{symm})\nabla X ,$$

where (symm) denotes the symmetric part of the tensor ∇X . Since the trace of an antisymmetric tensor is always zero, using (2.2) this gives the following formula:

$$(2.7) \quad (\text{div})X = \frac{1}{2}(\text{trace}) {}^{(X)}\pi .$$

A direct use of this gives the calculation:

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} X((\text{div})Y) - Y((\text{div})X) &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_X (g^{\alpha\beta} (\mathcal{L}_Y g)_{\alpha\beta}) - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_Y (g^{\alpha\beta} (\mathcal{L}_X g)_{\alpha\beta}) , \\ &= \frac{1}{2} g^{\alpha\beta} (\mathcal{L}_{[X,Y]} g)_{\alpha\beta} , \\ &= (\text{div})(\mathcal{L}_X Y) . \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for any vector-field X such that $(\text{div})X = \text{const.}$, we have the following useful formula:

$$X((\text{div})Y) = (\text{div})(\mathcal{L}_X Y) .$$

This discussion goes through almost verbatim for one-forms ω . In this case we

define:

$$(\operatorname{div})\omega = \nabla_\alpha \omega^\alpha .$$

Then using the identification $\omega^\alpha = g^{\alpha\beta}\omega_\beta$, we have from (2.8) and (2.4) that in any frame $\{e_\alpha\}$ that:

$$(2.9) \quad X((\operatorname{div})\omega) - \omega^\alpha e_\alpha((\operatorname{div})X) = -\nabla_\alpha {}^{(X)}\pi^{\alpha\beta}\omega_\beta + (\operatorname{div})(\mathcal{L}_X\omega) ,$$

Thus, again assuming that $(\operatorname{div})X = \text{const.}$ one can drop the second term on the left hand side of (2.9) above.

To extend the formulas (2.8) and (2.9) to higher order tensors, it is useful to define the Lie derivative of the Levi-Civita connection ∇ via the formula:

$$(2.10) \quad \mathcal{L}_X(\nabla) = \mathcal{L}_X\nabla - \nabla\mathcal{L}_X .$$

It is easy to see that (2.10) in fact defines the tensor, which in our zero curvature setting is given by:

$$\mathcal{L}_X(\nabla) = \nabla\nabla X .$$

This object acts in a multilinear fashion on sections to $T_l^k\mathcal{M}$. For example, with respect to a contravariant two-tensor the action reads:

$$(\mathcal{L}_X(\nabla)T)_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = (\nabla_\alpha\nabla_\beta X^\delta)T_{\delta\gamma} + (\nabla_\alpha\nabla_\gamma X^\delta)T_{\beta\delta} .$$

The above formula immediately applies to two-forms. In this case, if ${}^{(X)}\pi$ is a constant multiple of the metric $g_{\alpha\beta}$, which also implies that $(\operatorname{div})X = \text{const.}$ by formula (2.7), then antisymmetry and some simple manipulations yields the following important commutator formula:

$$(2.11) \quad \mathcal{L}_X\nabla^\beta F_{\alpha\beta} = -{}^{(X)}\pi^{\beta\gamma}\nabla_\gamma F_{\alpha\beta} + \nabla^\beta(\mathcal{L}_X F)_{\alpha\beta} .$$

This will be used in to differentiate the Maxwell equation (1.8) with respect to various vector-fields which are Killing and conformal Killing, and will be the basis of our analysis for that portion of the system (1.17).

We would now like to set up analogs of some of the above formulas for vector-fields and one-forms which are naturally associated with the complex line bundle V . We consider complexified versions of the tangent and cotangent bundles:

$$(2.12) \quad T^{\mathbb{C}}\mathcal{M} = V \otimes T\mathcal{M} , \quad T^{*\mathbb{C}}\mathcal{M} = V \otimes T^*\mathcal{M} .$$

In local coordinates, sections to these bundles can simply be identified with complex valued vector-fields and one-forms respectively. Of special significance is the full covariant derivative of a section to V , which we denote by $D\phi$. In accordance with the above notation, this can also be seen as the complex exterior derivative of the scalar ϕ which is defined via the natural formula:

$$D\phi(X) = D_X\phi .$$

This should be understood in analogy with the natural formula for the exterior derivative of a real valued scalar f on $\mathcal{M}$ which is given by $df(X) = X(f)$. For real scalars, one has the Lie derivative formula: $\mathcal{L}_X df = dX(f)$, and we seek an analog of this relation in the complex setting. Therefore, we define a covariant Lie derivative, called $\mathcal{L}^{\mathbb{C}}$ on the bundles (2.12) via the following formulas which hold for arbitrary tensors (in analogy with (1.4)):

$$(2.13) \quad \mathcal{L}_X^{\mathbb{C}}(T) = \mathcal{L}_X T + \sqrt{-1} A(X)T ,$$

where $\mathcal{L}_X T$ is somewhat abusive notation in that we consider T as a complex valued tensor, whose coefficients are computed in the trivialization of $\{A_\alpha\}$. It should be noted that by the Leibnitz rule, the formula (2.13) is completely gauge independent. In the sequel, we will not make explicit use of (2.13) which is instead provided as a concrete way of visualizing $\mathcal{L}^\mathbb{C}$. We note here that alternatively, one could define $\mathcal{L}^\mathbb{C}$ abstractly via the Leibnitz rule which would be sufficient for our purposes.

Now, using the commutator formula (1.5), it is seen that the complex Lie derivative satisfies the following natural formula with respect to D :

$$(2.14) \quad \mathcal{L}_X^\mathbb{C} D\phi = D(D_X \phi) + \sqrt{-1} i_X F \cdot \phi .$$

Here $(i_X F)_\alpha = X^\gamma F_{\gamma\alpha}$ is the interior product of X and F .

Next, using formula (2.13) we have the following useful expression involving complex scalars ϕ and complex valued one-forms η :

$$(2.15) \quad \mathcal{L}_X \Im(\phi \cdot \bar{\eta}) = \Im(D_X \phi \cdot \bar{\eta}) + \Im\left(\phi \cdot \overline{\mathcal{L}_X^\mathbb{C} \eta}\right) .$$

Furthermore, notice that from (2.13) the operation of complex Lie differentiation is well behaved with respect to contractions. For example, for a real valued two-form and real and complex vector-fields X, Y and Z (resp.) we have the formula:

$$(2.16) \quad D_Y F(X, Z) = \mathcal{L}_Y F(X, Z) + F([Y, X], Z) + F(X, \mathcal{L}_Y^\mathbb{C} Z) .$$

We will use this formula *instead* of the corresponding formula involving the covariant derivative ∇_Y . This is necessary because when we differentiate F it will always be with respect to $\mathcal{L}$ and *not* ∇ .

Finally, using a more abstract form of the formula (2.13), we compute the covariant divergence of a complex valued one-form via the implicit formula:

$$(\text{div})^\mathbb{C}(\phi \otimes \omega) = \omega^\alpha D_\alpha \phi + (\text{div})\omega \cdot \phi ,$$

for any complex scalar field ϕ and real one-form ω . Using this last line in conjunction with the identity (2.9) above, we have the following commutator formula for the complex divergence and complex Lie derivative for complex valued one-forms η :

$$D_X((\text{div})^\mathbb{C} \eta) - \eta^\alpha e_\alpha((\text{div})X) = -D_\alpha^{(X)} \pi^{\alpha\beta} \eta_\beta + (\text{div})^\mathbb{C}(\mathcal{L}_X^\mathbb{C} \eta) + \sqrt{-1} X^\alpha F_{\alpha\beta} \eta^\beta .$$

In particular, if $^{(X)}\pi$ is a constant multiple of the metric $g_{\alpha\beta}$, we have the following formula for the commutator of the covariant wave equation and the covariant derivative (or Lie derivative if you like) D_X :

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{aligned} & D^\alpha D_\alpha D_X \phi , \\ &= (\text{div})^\mathbb{C} D(D_X \phi) , \\ &= (\text{div})^\mathbb{C} (\mathcal{L}_X^\mathbb{C} D\phi - \sqrt{-1} i_X F \cdot \phi) , \\ &= D_X D^\alpha D_\alpha \phi + ^{(X)}\pi^{\alpha\beta} D_\alpha D_\beta \phi + \sqrt{-1} (2X^\alpha F_{\alpha\beta} D^\beta \phi - \nabla^\alpha (X^\beta F_{\alpha\beta}) \cdot \phi) . \end{aligned}$$

The important thing to notice here is that the above formula depends only on the curvature F and not the choice of gauge potentials $\{A_\alpha\}$.

2.2. The Null Frame, Lorentz Algebra, and Associated Covariant Derivatives. Of central importance to the analysis we do here is the freedom to perform calculations on the equations (1.17) in an arbitrary frame. In particular, the ability to use frames which do not arise from any system of coordinates. Since we are assuming that our initial data is both smooth and well localized around the origin in $\mathbb{R}^3$, there is a canonical choice of frame for our problem. This is the so called *standard spherical null frame*. The first two members of this are the null generators of forward and backward light cones which we define respectively as:

$$(2.18) \quad L = \partial_t + \partial_r, \quad \underline{L} = \partial_t - \partial_r.$$

To complete things, we need only define derivatives in the angular directions. This can be done in an identical fashion on each time slice $\{t = \text{const.}\}$ so we only need to define things on $\mathbb{R}^3$. If we let $\{e_A^0\}_{A=1,2}$ denote a local orthonormal frame for the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^3$, then for each value of the radial variable we can by extension define:

$$(2.19) \quad e_A = \frac{1}{r} e_A^0.$$

Thus the collection $\{e_A\}_{A=1,2}$ forms an orthonormal basis on each sphere $\{r = \text{const.}\}$ on each fixed time slice. We can write the usual translation invariant frame $\{\partial_i\}$ in terms of ∂_r and this basis as follows:

$$\partial_i = \omega_i \partial_r + \omega_i^A e_A,$$

where $\omega_i^A = e_A(x^i)$, which follows at once from the formula:

$$(2.20) \quad \omega_i^A = \langle \partial_i, e_A \rangle = dx^i(e_A) = e_A(x^i).$$

In line above we have used in order orthonormality, duality, and then simply the definition of exterior derivative. Also, we note here that the $\{\omega_i^A\}$ are part of a rotation matrix at each point, which implies the following useful formulas:

$$(2.21) \quad \omega^i \omega_i^A = 0, \quad \omega_A^i \omega_i^B = \delta_A^B, \quad \omega_i^A \omega_A^j = \delta_i^j - \omega_i \omega^j.$$

With respect to the full frame $\{\underline{L}, L, e_A\}$, the Minkowski metric reads:

$$g = -2\theta^{\underline{L}} \otimes \theta^L - 2\theta^L \otimes \theta^{\underline{L}} + \delta_{AB} \theta^A \otimes \theta^B,$$

where $\{\theta^{\underline{L}}, \theta^L, \theta^A\}$ is the corresponding dual frame. Associated with this null frame are the standard optical functions:

$$(2.22) \quad \underline{u} = t + r, \quad u = t - r.$$

Note that one has the identities:

$$\begin{aligned} L(\underline{u}) &= 2, & \underline{L}(\underline{u}) &= 0, \\ L(u) &= 0, & \underline{L}(u) &= 2. \end{aligned}$$

In particular both u and $\underline{u}$ solve the eikonal equation $\nabla^\alpha h \nabla_\alpha h = 0$. In terms of the frame (2.18)–(2.19) we have the standard null decomposition of the electro-magnetic field tensor F , as well as the gradient $D\phi$. As usual we define:

$$(2.23a) \quad \alpha_A = F_{LA}, \quad \underline{\alpha}_A = F_{\underline{L}A},$$

$$(2.23b) \quad \rho = \frac{1}{2} F_{\underline{L}L}, \quad \sigma = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{AB} F_{AB}.$$

Using the duality operator $*$, we have the useful formulas for the null decomposition of $*F$, where $\in_{AB} = \frac{1}{2} \in_{\underline{L}L} AB$ is the volume element on the spheres $r = \text{const.}$:

$$(2.24a) \quad {}^* \alpha_A = - \in_A^B \alpha_B, \quad {}^* \underline{\alpha}_A = \in_A^B \underline{\alpha}_B,$$

$$(2.24b) \quad {}^* \rho = \sigma, \quad {}^* \sigma = -\rho.$$

One can expand out the energy-momentum tensors (1.13) and (1.11) in the null directions (2.18). Using the identifications (2.23), for the electro-magnetic field these read:

$$(2.25a) \quad Q(L, L)[F] = \delta^{AB} \alpha_A \alpha_B = |\alpha|^2,$$

$$(2.25b) \quad Q(\underline{L}, \underline{L})[F] = \delta^{AB} \underline{\alpha}_A \underline{\alpha}_B = |\underline{\alpha}|^2,$$

$$(2.25c) \quad Q(\underline{L}, L)[F] = \rho^2 + \sigma^2.$$

Furthermore, for the energy-momentum tensor of the scalar field (1.13), one has that:

$$(2.26a) \quad Q(L, L)[\phi] = |D_L \phi|^2,$$

$$(2.26b) \quad Q(\underline{L}, \underline{L})[\phi] = |D_{\underline{L}} \phi|^2,$$

$$(2.26c) \quad Q(\underline{L}, L)[\phi] = \delta^{AB} D_A \phi \overline{D_B \phi} = |\not{D}\phi|^2.$$

Next, we record here the following standard formulas for the Levi-Civita connection ∇ with respect to this frame. This will be used many times in the sequel:

$$(2.27a) \quad \nabla_L L = 0, \quad \nabla_{\underline{L}} L = 0,$$

$$(2.27b) \quad \nabla_{\underline{L}} \underline{L} = 0, \quad \nabla_L \underline{L} = 0,$$

$$(2.27c) \quad \nabla_L e_A = 0, \quad \nabla_{\underline{L}} e_A = 0,$$

$$(2.27d) \quad \nabla_{e_A} L = \frac{1}{r} e_A, \quad \nabla_{e_A} \underline{L} = -\frac{1}{r} e_A,$$

$$(2.27e) \quad \nabla_{e_A} e_B = \overline{\nabla}_{e_A} e_B + \frac{1}{2r} \delta_{AB} (\underline{L} - L),$$

$$(2.27f) \quad = \overline{\Gamma}_{AB}^D e_D + \frac{1}{2r} \delta_{AB} (\underline{L} - L).$$

Here, $\overline{\nabla}$ denotes the intrinsic covariant differentiation on spheres, and $\overline{\Gamma}$ its associated frame-Christoffel symbols. The key property of the $\overline{\Gamma}$ we will use in the sequel is that they are homogeneous functions of degree -1 with respect to the radial variable r .

Our result is based in part on the usual process of obtaining weighted energy inequalities, which in turn give L^∞ estimates of the type (1.26)–(1.27). The weights in these kind of estimates are closely related to the Killing and conformal-Killing structure of Minkowski space, as was first realized to full effect in the seminal work [8]. Accordingly, we introduce the inhomogeneous Lorentz algebra:

$$(2.28) \quad \mathbb{L} = \{\partial_\alpha, \Omega_{\alpha\beta}, S\},$$

where we use $x^0 = t$ and $x_0 = -t$ to express:

$$(2.29) \quad \Omega_{\alpha\beta} = x_\alpha \partial_\beta - x_\beta \partial_\alpha ,$$

$$(2.30) \quad S = x^\alpha \partial_\alpha .$$

This collection of vector-fields satisfy the well known algebraic relations:

$$(2.31a) \quad [\partial_\alpha, \Omega_{\beta\gamma}] = \delta_{\alpha[\beta} \partial_{\gamma]} ,$$

$$(2.31b) \quad [\Omega_{\alpha\beta}, \Omega_{\gamma\sigma}] = -\delta_{(\alpha\gamma} \Omega_{\beta\sigma)} ,$$

$$(2.31c) \quad [\partial_\alpha, S] = \partial_\alpha ,$$

$$(2.31d) \quad [\Omega_{\alpha\beta}, S] = 0 .$$

Expanding the formulas (2.29)–(2.30) out in the frame (2.18)–(2.19), and using the symbol $\omega_i^A = \theta^A(\partial_i)$ we have the null decompositions:

$$(2.32a) \quad \partial_0 = \frac{1}{2}(L + \underline{L}) ,$$

$$(2.32b) \quad \partial_i = \frac{\omega_i}{2}(L - \underline{L}) + \omega_i^A e_A ,$$

$$(2.32c) \quad \Omega_{ij} = \Omega_{ij}^A e_A = (x_i \omega_j^A - x_j \omega_i^A) e_A ,$$

$$(2.32d) \quad \Omega_{i0} = \frac{\omega_i}{2}(\underline{u}L - u\underline{L}) + t\omega_i^A e_A ,$$

$$(2.32e) \quad S = \frac{1}{2}(\underline{u}L + u\underline{L}) .$$

It will also be necessary for us to have a precise account of the algebraic relations between the frame (2.18)–(2.19) and the fields (2.28). These can easily be computed using the formulas (2.32). We record this computation here as:

$$(2.33a) \quad [L, \partial_0] = [\underline{L}, \partial_0] = [e_A, \partial_0] = 0 ,$$

$$(2.33b) \quad [L, \partial_i] = \omega_i^A [L, e_A] = -\frac{\omega_i^A}{r} e_A ,$$

$$(2.33c) \quad [\underline{L}, \partial_i] = \omega_i^A [\underline{L}, e_A] = \frac{\omega_i^A}{r} e_A ,$$

$$(2.33d) \quad [L, \Omega_{ij}] = -[\underline{L}, \Omega_{ij}] = 0 ,$$

$$(2.33e) \quad [e_B, \Omega_{ij}] = e_B(\Omega_{ij}^A) e_A + \Omega_{ij}^A \mathbf{c}_{BA}^D e_D ,$$

$$(2.33f) \quad [L, \Omega_{i0}] = \omega_i L - \frac{u}{r} \omega_i^A e_A ,$$

$$(2.33g) \quad [\underline{L}, \Omega_{i0}] = -\omega_i \underline{L} + \frac{u}{r} \omega_i^A e_A ,$$

$$(2.33h) \quad [e_B, \Omega_{i0}] = \frac{\omega_{Bi}}{2r}(\underline{u}L - u\underline{L}) - t\omega_i^A \bar{\Gamma}_{AB}^D e_D ,$$

$$(2.33i) \quad [L, S] = L ,$$

$$(2.33j) \quad [\underline{L}, S] = \underline{L} ,$$

$$(2.33k) \quad [e_A, S] = e_A .$$

In formula (2.33e) above we have set $\mathbf{c}_{AB}^D = [e_A, e_B]^D$, which is again a smooth function homogeneous of degree -1 in the radial variable r . Also, on line (2.33h) we have used the identities:

$$e_B(\omega_i^A) = \nabla_{e_B} \theta^A(\partial_i) = -\delta_B^A \frac{\omega_i}{r} - \bar{\Gamma}_{BD}^A \omega_i^D , \quad \mathbf{c}_{BA}^D = \bar{\Gamma}_{BA}^D - \bar{\Gamma}_{AB}^D .$$

Finally, to end this subsection, we list here the various formula for the action of the Levi-Civita connection ∇ on the algebra (2.28). All of these formulas are computed in a straightforward way using the identities (2.27) and (2.32):

$$(2.34a) \quad \nabla_L \partial_\alpha = \nabla_{\underline{L}} \partial_\alpha = \nabla_{e_A} \partial_\alpha = 0 ,$$

$$(2.34b) \quad \nabla_L \Omega_{ij} = -\nabla_{\underline{L}} \Omega_{ij} = \frac{1}{r} \Omega_{ij} ,$$

$$(2.34c) \quad \nabla_{e_B} \Omega_{ij} = e_B(\Omega_{ij}^A) e_A + \Omega_{ij}^A \bar{\Gamma}_{BA}^D e_D + \frac{1}{2r} \Omega_{ij}^B (\underline{L} - L) ,$$

$$(2.34d) \quad \nabla_L \Omega_{i0} = \omega_i L + \omega_i^A e_A ,$$

$$(2.34e) \quad \nabla_{\underline{L}} \Omega_{i0} = -\omega_i \underline{L} + \omega_i^A e_A ,$$

$$(2.34f) \quad \nabla_{e_B} \Omega_{i0} = \frac{\omega_{Bi}}{2} (L + \underline{L}) ,$$

$$(2.34g) \quad \nabla_L S = L ,$$

$$(2.34h) \quad \nabla_{\underline{L}} S = \underline{L} ,$$

$$(2.34i) \quad \nabla_{e_A} S = e_A .$$

3. FIXED TIME AND SPACE-TIME ENERGY ESTIMATES FOR THE CURVATURE

In this section, we begin to build the estimates which lie at the center of our approach. All of these will be produced in some way through the tensorial conservation laws (1.12) and (1.14). In this section we will deal with weighted L^2 type estimates which involve the curvature tensor $F_{\alpha\beta}$. We assume that this satisfies the Maxwell equation (1.8) for an unspecified current density J_α .

On Minkowski space, the two most basic energy estimates (really identities) for $F_{\alpha\beta}$ are based respectively on time translation invariance and the conformal structure of the Minkowski metric. This is utilized by contracting the energy-momentum tensor (1.11) with the following two vector fields (respectively):

$$(3.1) \quad T = \partial_0 = \frac{1}{2} (L + \underline{L}) ,$$

$$(3.2) \quad K_0 = (t^2 + |x|^2) \partial_0 + 2tx^i \partial_i = \frac{1}{2} (\underline{u}^2 L + u^2 \underline{L}) .$$

One readily computes their deformation tensors to be:

$${}^{(T)}\pi = 0 , \quad {}^{(K_0)}\pi = 4t g .$$

Due to the trace-free nature of the energy-momentum tensor (1.11), the one-form resulting from such a contraction is seen to be divergence free. Therefore, defining the weights:

$$(3.3) \quad \tau_+^2 = 1 + \underline{u}^2 , \quad \tau_-^2 = 1 + u^2$$

and the hybrid vector-field:

$$\overline{K}_0 = T + K_0 ,$$

we arrive at the following fundamental estimate through the application of the geometric Stokes theorem⁸ over domains of the type $\{u \leq u_0\} \cap \{0 \leq t \leq t_0\}$ and expanding out the resulting quantities using the identities (2.25):

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.4) \quad & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \cap \{t=t_0\}} \tau_+^2 |\alpha|^2 + \tau_-^2 |\underline{\alpha}|^2 + (\tau_+^2 + \tau_-^2)(\rho^2 + \sigma^2) \, dx \\
 & + \sup_u \int_{C(u) \cap \{0 \leq t \leq t_0\}} \tau_+^2 |\alpha|^2 + \tau_-^2 (\rho^2 + \sigma^2) \, dV_{C(u)} \\
 & \lesssim \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |(\overline{K}_0)^\alpha F_{\alpha\beta} J^\beta| \, dx dt + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \cap \{t=0\}} (1+r^2)(|E|^2 + |H|^2) \, dx .
 \end{aligned}$$

Here $dV_{C(u)}$ is the Euclidean volume element on the cone $\{t-r=u\}$.

As it stands, estimate (3.4) is not terribly useful except in certain restricted situations. This is because in general it is not possible to assume that the right hand side of (3.4) above is finite, even if one assumes that the “dynamic” portion of the initial data is compactly supported. This is the effect of the constraint equation on line (1.10a). Indeed, taking a Hodge decomposition $E = E^{df} + E^{cf}$ of E into its divergence-free and curl-free components (respectively), and introducing the potential function:

$$E^{cf} = \nabla \varphi ,$$

we see that this constraint is equivalent to the elliptic equation:

$$(3.5) \quad \Delta \varphi = J_0 .$$

In particular, it is not possible for E to decay better than $E \sim \frac{1}{r^2}$ unless the following quantity known as the *charge* vanishes:

$$(3.6) \quad q(F)(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} J_0(t) \, dx .$$

Notice that this quantity is a constant of motion thanks to the continuity equation (1.16). Therefore, we shall henceforth refer to it as $q(F)$ and drop the dependence on t . Because of the weights involved, there is no hope of obtaining a finite value for the energy (3.4) without the extra assumption that $q(F) = 0$.

In order to circumvent this problem it is necessary to either modify the energy (3.4) so that less decay of the initial data is required, or to modify the field equations (1.8) themselves so that the behavior resulting from the charge is eliminated. A naive approach to the first tactic would be to simply decrease the amount of decay required on the right hand side of (3.4). For example, this can be done by eliminating the use of the conformal field (3.2). As we shall see in a moment, it does not seem possible to do this and still retain the distinct weights (peeling) on the different components on the left hand side of (3.4). Furthermore, recall that the simple scaling argument used in the introduction implies that it should not be possible to close a global existence proof for the system (1.17) under the assumption of a total decay rate for the curvature less than $F \sim \frac{1}{r^2}$ at space-like infinity. Therefore, we use a different approach here.

⁸We shall discuss this type of procedure in more detail in the sequel. See also [3] for a more thorough discussion and a derivation of this particular estimate.

A more sophisticated approach to the first tactic, which has been used by other authors in similar contexts [4], would be to employ some Lie derivatives to the field strength $F_{\alpha\beta}$ before putting it in weighted L^2 in order to kill off the effect of the charge. For instance, the Lie derivatives with respect to the rotation fields Ω_{ij} work well to accomplish this because the leading order behavior of the charge is spherically symmetric. However, this strategy runs into technical complications when it comes to dealing with the boost vector fields Ω_{i0} , which we will make essential use of in our proof of the sharp weighted $L^2(L^\infty)$. Therefore, we shall follow a tactic which is both conceptually and technically much simpler. This is as follows: Solving the charge equation (3.5) explicitly, we see that:

$$\varphi(t, x) = - \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{|x - y|} J_0(t, y) dy .$$

Therefore, at fixed time, we have the following asymptotic behavior for E^{cf} as $r \rightarrow \infty$:

$$(3.7) \quad E_i^{cf} \sim q \cdot \frac{\omega_i}{4\pi r^2} .$$

Since this behavior is sufficiently simple we shall subtract it off, proving estimates for the remaining field strength. However, to do this correctly it is necessary to take into account the behavior of the charge in the wave zone $t \sim r$. Although it is not obvious at first, there is a jump type behavior of the charged component of E across the cone $u = 0$ as long as the current vector J_α satisfies certain weighted estimates which are consistent with the right hand side of (3.4) above. Keeping (3.7) in mind, the approximation we make to the charged component E_i^{cf} is the following. We first define the *charge two-form*, denoted by $\overline{F}_{\alpha\beta}$, via the exterior derivative (for $0 \leq t$):

$$(3.8) \quad \overline{F} = - \frac{q(F)}{4\pi} d \left(\left[\int_0^r \frac{1}{s^2} \chi^+(s - t - 2) ds \right] dt \right) .$$

In the above formula, χ^+ denotes a smoothed out version of the Heaviside function; i.e. a non-decreasing C^∞ function equal to 0 on $(-\infty, 0]$ and 1 on $[1, \infty)$. Notice that by design, the tensor $\overline{F}_{\alpha\beta}$ satisfies the Bianchi identity (1.8b) because it is exact. Also, one has the explicit formulas for the electric-magnetic decomposition (1.9) of $\overline{F}$:

$$(3.9) \quad \overline{E}_i = q \cdot \frac{\omega_i}{4\pi r^2} \chi^+(r - t - 2) , \quad \overline{H}_i = 0 .$$

This last expression shows that $\overline{F}$ indeed represents a charge with asymptotic (3.7) which propagates in the exterior of the light-cone $u = 0$. In terms of the null decomposition (2.23), the formula (3.9) is even simpler and becomes:

$$(3.10) \quad \overline{\rho} = \rho(\overline{F}) = \omega^i \overline{E}_i = q \cdot \frac{1}{4\pi r^2} \chi^+(r - t - 2) , \quad \overline{\alpha} = \underline{\alpha} = \overline{\sigma} = 0 ,$$

and the associated current vector⁹ is easily computed to be:

$$\overline{J}_L = q \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi r^2} (\chi^+)'(r - t - 2) , \quad \overline{J}_L = \overline{J}_A = 0 ,$$

⁹That is, plugging $\overline{F}$ into the field equation (1.8).

In particular, we have that:

$$(3.11) \quad \overline{J}_0(t, r) = q \cdot \frac{1}{4\pi r^2} (\chi^+)'(r - t - 2) .$$

Notice that the current vector $\overline{J}_\alpha$ is only supported in the region $u \sim 0$ and has only a $\underline{L}$ component. This will allow us to obtain good estimates when it appears as an error on the right hand side of expressions such as (3.4).

The main estimates we need to prove now are for the remaining field strength:

$$(3.12) \quad \tilde{F} = F - \overline{F} .$$

This satisfies the field equations (1.8) with current vector:

$$(3.13) \quad \tilde{J}_\alpha = J_\alpha - \overline{J}_\alpha .$$

A simple calculation using the formula (3.11) shows that the charge for the modified field strength $\tilde{F}$ vanishes:

$$q(\tilde{F}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (J_0 - \overline{J}_0) dx = 0 .$$

This formula, used in conjunction with certain weighted elliptic estimates for gradients (see appendix 10), allows control of the right hand side of (3.4) above with F replaced by $\tilde{F}$. We shall return to this in a moment, after we have first discussed the previously mentioned idea of decreasing the powers occurring in the weights in estimate (3.4).

In the sequel we shall consider Maxwell fields $F_{\alpha\beta}$ such that the remainder $\tilde{F}_{\alpha\beta}$ satisfies various rates of decay; not necessarily the amount which comes from the usual Morawetz estimate (3.4). This can be understood as making different assumptions as to how “asymptotically flat” the initial data for $F_{\alpha\beta}$ is after one has subtracted off the contribution of the charge (3.9) at time $t = 0$. The least amount of decay which is consistent with a finite value for the charge (3.6) is essentially $\tilde{E} \sim r^{-(2+\gamma)}$ for some $0 < \gamma$. Large values for γ are available depending on the weighted decay of J_0 as well as the vanishing of higher moments for this quantity. In order to be able to take these various rates of decay into account for the range $0 < \gamma \leq 1$, we would like a version of estimate (3.4) with weights of the form $(1 + r^2)^s$ on the right hand side for $\frac{1}{2} \leq s \leq 1$. It will be essential for us to be able to do this in such a way that distinct decay rates, also known as peeling, are still available for the various components in the null decomposition (2.23). This will be accomplished below through a suitable modification of the Morawetz field (3.2).

Finally, before stating and proving the main result of this section, let us mention in words one further adjustment to the classical Morawetz estimate (3.4) which will be of great use in the sequel. This involves adding some space-time energies to the left hand side of (3.4). These additional estimates turn out to be more than just a mere technical convenience, and are in fact essential for us to avoid certain logarithmic divergences which would enter when trying to use the usual procedure of matching fixed time energy and pure L^∞ bounds.

We now state the basic general energy estimate we will use for the curvature $F_{\alpha\beta}$ which is:

Proposition 3.1 (Generalized Morawetz estimate for the electro-magnetic field with non-vanishing charge). *Let $F_{\alpha\beta}$ be a two-form which satisfies the system (1.8) with current vector J_α , and let $q(F)$ and $\tilde{F}$ be the associated charge and remainder field strength defined by formulas (3.6) and (3.12) respectively. Furthermore, let $0 < \gamma, \epsilon$ and $\frac{1}{2} < s \leq 1$ be given parameters such that $s + \gamma < \frac{3}{2}$ as well as $\epsilon \leq s - \frac{1}{2}$, and define the weights:*

$$(3.14) \quad \tau_0 = \tau_- / \tau_+ ,$$

$$(3.15) \quad w_\gamma(t, r) = \chi^+(r-t) \cdot \tau_-^{2\gamma} + (1 - \chi^+(r-t)) ,$$

$$(3.16) \quad w_{\gamma, \epsilon}(t, r) = \chi^+(r-t) \cdot \tau_-^{2\gamma} + (1 - \chi^+(r-t)) \cdot \tau_-^{2\epsilon} ,$$

$$(3.17) \quad w'_{\gamma, \epsilon}(t, r) = \chi^+(r-t) \cdot \tau_-^{2\gamma-1} + (1 - \chi^+(r-t)) \cdot \tau_-^{2\epsilon-1} .$$

Define the remainder null decomposition:

$$(3.18a)$$

$$(3.18b) \quad \begin{aligned} \alpha_A &= F_{LA} = \tilde{F}_{LA} , & \underline{\alpha}_A &= F_{\underline{L}A} = \tilde{F}_{\underline{L}A} , \\ \tilde{\rho} &= \frac{1}{2}(F_{\underline{L}\underline{L}} - \overline{F}_{\underline{L}\underline{L}}) = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{F}_{\underline{L}\underline{L}} , & \sigma &= \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{AB} F_{AB} = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{AB} \tilde{F}_{AB} . \end{aligned}$$

Now define the charge modified generalized Morawetz type energy content of F in the time slab $\{0 \leq t \leq t_0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3$ to be:

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{aligned} E_0^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, t_0)[F] &= |q(F)|^2 \\ &+ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \cap \{t\}} (\tau_+^{2s} |\alpha|^2 + \tau_-^{2s} |\underline{\alpha}|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} (\tilde{\rho}^2 + \sigma^2)) w_\gamma dx \\ &+ \sup_u \int_{\{C(u)\} \cap \{0 \leq t \leq t_0\}} (\tau_+^{2s} |\alpha|^2 + \tau_-^{2s} (\tilde{\rho}^2 + \sigma^2)) w_\gamma dV_{C(u)} \\ &+ \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\tau_+^{2s} |\alpha|^2 + \tau_0^{1+2\epsilon} (\tau_-^{2s} |\underline{\alpha}|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} \tilde{\rho}^2 + \tau_+^{2s} \sigma^2)) w'_{\gamma, \epsilon} dx dt . \end{aligned}$$

Then one has the following general weighted energy type estimate:

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{aligned} E_0^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, t_0)[F] &\leq \\ C_{\gamma, \epsilon} &\left[\int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\tau_+^{2s+1+2\epsilon} \tau_-^{2\epsilon} |J_L|^2 + \tau_+^{1+2\epsilon-2s} \tau_-^{4s-2\epsilon} |J_{\underline{L}}|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} \tau_- |\not{J}|^2) w_{\gamma, \epsilon} dx dt \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \cap \{t=0\}} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma} (|E^{df}|^2 + |H|^2) dx + \|(1+r)^{s+\gamma} J_0(0)\|_{L_x^{\frac{6}{5}}}^2 \right] . \end{aligned}$$

Here, $C(u)$ denotes the forward facing light-cone $t - r = u$ for fixed values of u . Furthermore, $|\not{J}|^2 = \delta^{AB} J_A J_B$ denotes the angular portion of $|J|^2$.

Proof of estimate (3.20). The proof closely follows the general strategy for proving estimates of the type (3.4) with a few additions. We first introduce a warped

generalization of the conformal killing field (3.2). This is:

$$(3.21) \quad K_0^s = \frac{1}{2} \underline{u}^{2s} L + \frac{1}{2} |u|^{2s} \underline{L}.$$

Here we will allow s to range as $\frac{1}{2} \leq s \leq 1$. In order to gain some intuition as to the nature of K_0^s , notice that this vector-field essentially interpolates between the conformal Killing fields K_0 and S , which are its endpoint values in the interior region $0 \leq u$ for $s = 1$ and $s = \frac{1}{2}$ respectively. In order for this analogy to have value, it must be seen that the deformation tensor of K_0^s enjoys some positivity property when contracted with a trace-free 2-tensor which satisfies the positive energy condition. This is indeed seen to be the case through the following calculations. We let:

$$\underline{v}(\underline{u}) = \underline{u}^{2s}, \quad v(u) = |u|^{2s},$$

be short hand for the fractional weights. Then, with respect to the Minkowski metric $g_{\alpha\beta}$, the deformation tensor of K_0^s is easily calculated using the identities (2.6) and (2.27):

$$(3.22) \quad {}^{(K_0^s)}\pi = \frac{\underline{v} - v}{r} g + 2 \left(\frac{\underline{v} - v}{r} - (\dot{\underline{v}} + \dot{v}) \right) (\theta^{\underline{L}} \otimes \theta^L + \theta^L \otimes \theta^{\underline{L}}).$$

In the above expression, the dot notation is used to indicate the derivative of v and $\underline{v}$ as functions of a single variable. For example, we have that $\dot{\underline{v}} = 2s|u|^{2s-1} \cdot \text{sgn}(u)$. The positivity claim now follows once we have shown that the factor on the second term in (3.22) is non-negative:

Lemma 3.2. *Setting let $\frac{1}{2} \leq s \leq 1$ and $\underline{v} = \underline{u}^{2s}$ and $v = u^{2s}$. Then one has that:*

$$(3.23) \quad 0 \leq \left(\frac{\underline{v} - v}{r} - (\dot{\underline{v}} + \dot{v}) \right).$$

Proof of (3.23). This follows immediately from freshman calculus. For fixed t , we define the function of r :

$$f(r) = \underline{v}(t+r) - v(t-r).$$

Notice that we have $f(0) = 0$. We also have that $f' = \dot{\underline{v}} + \dot{v}$. Therefore, from the mean value theorem there exists some $r_0 \in [0, r]$ such that:

$$\frac{f(r)}{r} = f'(r_0) = \dot{\underline{v}}(t+r_0) + \dot{v}(t-r_0).$$

The claim (3.23) then follows if we know that f' is a non-increasing function of r . This function is computed to be:

$$(3.24) \quad f'(r) = 2s(r+t)^{2s-1} + 2s|t-r|^{2s-1} \cdot \text{sgn}(t-r).$$

For $s = \frac{1}{2}$, this function is easily seen to be decreasing by direct inspection. For the range $\frac{1}{2} < s \leq 1$, (3.24) is continuous so we only need to show that $f'' \leq 0$ when $0 < r$. Calculating the second derivative we see that:

$$f''(r) = (2s-1)2s (\underline{u}^{2s-2} - |u|^{2s-2}).$$

The desired result now follows from the fact that $0 < (2s-1)2s$ while $(2s-2) \leq 0$ and $|u| \leq \underline{u}$. $\square$

We now form a momentum density associated with the charge free portion $\tilde{F}$ of F , as according to equations (3.12) and (3.8), and the extra γ, ϵ weights defined in the statement of Proposition 3.1 above:

$$(3.25) \quad P_\alpha^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}[F] = Q_{\alpha\beta}[\tilde{F}](\overline{K}_0^s)^\beta \cdot \tilde{w}_{\gamma, \epsilon},$$

where $\overline{K}_s^0 = T + K_0^s$ and the weight function $\tilde{w}_{\gamma, \epsilon}$ is defined as:

$$(3.26) \quad \tilde{w}_{\gamma, \epsilon} = \left((1 + (2 - u)^{2\gamma}) \chi^+(-u) + (1 + (2 + u)^{-2\epsilon}) (1 - \chi^+(-u)) \right) + \\ (1 + \underline{u})^{-2\epsilon} \cdot \left((2 - u)^{2\gamma+2\epsilon} \chi^+(-u) + 1 - \chi^+(-u) \right).$$

Here χ^+ can be taken to be the same smoothed out Heaviside function used in line (3.8) above. In particular, $(\chi^+)'$ is positive and supported on the interval $[0, 1]$. This last assumption assures that the term $(2 + u)^{-2\epsilon}(1 - \chi^+(-u))$ on the right hand side above is never singular. The weight function $\tilde{w}_{\gamma, \epsilon}$ and its derivatives satisfy simple bounds with respect to the weight functions w_γ and $w'_{\gamma, \epsilon}$ defined on lines (3.15)–(3.17) above. First, notice that one has the bounds:

$$C^{-1}w_\gamma \leq \tilde{w}_{\gamma, \epsilon} \leq Cw_\gamma,$$

for a suitable positive constant C . We will restate this estimate as follows:

$$(3.27) \quad \tilde{w}_{\gamma, \epsilon} \sim w_\gamma.$$

Furthermore, a brief calculation shows that:

$$(3.28) \quad -\frac{1}{2}L(\tilde{w}_{\gamma, \epsilon}) = -\partial_{\underline{u}}(\tilde{w}_{\gamma, \epsilon}), \\ = 2\epsilon(1 + \underline{u})^{-2\epsilon-1} \cdot \left((2 - u)^{2\gamma+2\epsilon} \chi^+(-u) + 1 - \chi^+(-u) \right), \\ \sim C_{\gamma, \epsilon}^{-1} \tau_0^{1+2\epsilon} w'_{\gamma, \epsilon}.$$

A similar calculation shows that:

$$(3.29) \quad -\frac{1}{2}\underline{L}(\tilde{w}_{\gamma, \epsilon}) = -\partial_u(\tilde{w}_{\gamma, \epsilon}), \\ = \left((2 - u)^{2\gamma} - (2 + u)^{-2\epsilon} \right) (\chi^+)'(-u) + \\ (1 + \underline{u})^{-2\epsilon} \left((2 - u)^{2\gamma+2\epsilon} - 1 \right) (\chi^+)'(-u) + \\ 2(\gamma + \epsilon)(1 + \underline{u})^{-2\epsilon} (2 - u)^{2\gamma+2\epsilon-1} \chi^+(-u) + \\ 2\gamma(2 - u)^{2\gamma-1} \chi^+(-u) + 2\epsilon(2 + u)^{-2\epsilon-1} (1 - \chi^+(-u)), \\ \sim C_{\gamma, \epsilon}^{-1} w'_{\gamma, \epsilon}.$$

The bound on the last line follows because one has:

$$(2 + u)^{\delta_1} \leq (2 - u)^{\delta_2},$$

whenever $\delta_1 \leq \delta_2$ and $u \in [-1, 0]$. Note again that $(\chi^+)'$ is a positive function. Also, it is clear that the constant implicit in the $\sim$ notation on lines (3.27)–(3.29) above can be taken to be the same value uniform in ϵ and γ because we kept the effect of these constants in our bounds with the $C_{\gamma, \epsilon}$ notation. We will continue to use the $\sim$ notation in the remainder of this proof with the understanding that the same implicit constant is being used throughout.

Now, calculating the space-time divergence of the quantity (3.25) we have that:

$$(3.30) \quad \begin{aligned} \nabla^\alpha P_\alpha^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[F] &= \tilde{F}_{\alpha\beta} \tilde{J}^\alpha (\overline{K}_0^s)^\beta \cdot \tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon} + \frac{1}{2} Q_{\alpha\beta}[\tilde{F}] (\overline{K}_0^s)^\alpha \pi^{\alpha\beta} \cdot \tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} Q_{L\beta}[\tilde{F}] (\overline{K}_0^s)^\beta \cdot L(\tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon}) - \frac{1}{2} Q_{L\beta}[\tilde{F}] (\overline{K}_0^s)^\beta \cdot \underline{L}(\tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon}) . \end{aligned}$$

Integrating both sides of this last line over time slabs of the form:

$$\mathcal{R}(t_0, u_0) = \{0 \leq t \leq t_0\} \cap \{u \leq u_0\} ,$$

and applying the geometric version of the Stokes theorem (Gauss theorem) we arrive at the following general integral identity:

$$(3.31) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \{-u_0 \leq r\}} P_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[F] dx &= \int_{\{t=t_0\} \cap \{t_0 - u_0 \leq r\}} P_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[F] dx \\ &\quad + \int_{C(u_0) \cap \{0 \leq t \leq t_0\}} P_L^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[F] dV_{C(u_0)} + \int \int_{\mathcal{R}(t_0, u_0)} (\text{R.H.S.})(3.30) . \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the above identity reduces to the usual energy type estimate on the time slab $\{0 \leq t \leq t_0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3$ when $t_0 \leq u_0$. In order to proceed, we now calculate each of the terms in (3.31) individually.

When $t = 0$, we compute that:

$$(3.32) \quad P_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[F] \sim (1 + r^2)^{s+\gamma} (|\tilde{E}|^2 + |H|^2) ,$$

where again the $\sim$ notation here means that the ratio of the two terms above is bounded by on the left and right by C^{-1} and C respectively for a suitable *positive* constant C . In particular, if the right hand side of such an expression is positive, then so is the left. Also, $\tilde{E}$ denotes the electric part of the tensor $\tilde{F}$ while H is the magnetic part of F . Note that:

$$\tilde{E} = E - \overline{E} ,$$

where $\overline{E}$ is defined as on line (3.9) above. Likewise, with the help of the identities (2.25), we compute that at time $t = t_0$:

$$(3.33) \quad P_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[F] \sim (\tau_+^{2s} |\alpha|^2 + \tau_-^{2s} |\underline{\alpha}|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} (\tilde{\rho}^2 + \sigma^2)) \cdot w_\gamma .$$

We also compute the characteristic energy term:

$$(3.34) \quad P_L^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[F] \sim (\tau_+^{2s} |\alpha|^2 + \tau_-^{2s} (\tilde{\rho}^2 + \sigma^2)) \cdot w_\gamma .$$

It remains to calculate the terms on the right hand side of (3.30) above. Since the first such term does not have a sign, we simply expand it using the null decomposition (3.18a)–(3.18b) and the definition of $\tilde{J}$ given by (3.13) above as well as the estimate (3.27) to bound:

$$(3.35) \quad \begin{aligned} |\tilde{F}_{\alpha\beta} \tilde{J}^\alpha (\overline{K}_0^s)^\beta \cdot \tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon}| &\lesssim \\ &\left(\tau_+^{2s} (|\alpha| \cdot |\not{J}| + |\tilde{\rho}| \cdot |J_L|) + \tau_-^{2s} (|\underline{\alpha}| \cdot |\not{J}| + |\tilde{\rho}| \cdot |J_L|) \right) \cdot w_\gamma + |\tilde{\rho}| \cdot |q| \cdot \tau_+^{-2} \tau_-^{-10} w_\gamma . \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the extra τ_- weight on the last term of the right hand side above comes because $\tilde{J}$ is supported in the region where $\tau_- \sim 1$.

We now calculate the second term on the right hand side of (3.30) above. Because $Q_{\alpha\beta}[F]$ is trace-free and T is Killing with respect to $g_{\alpha\beta}$, the contraction need only be taken with the second term on the right hand side of line (3.22). This yields:

$$(3.36) \quad Q_{\alpha\beta}[\tilde{F}] (\overline{K}_0^s) \pi^{\alpha\beta} \cdot \tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon} \sim \left(\frac{\underline{v} - v}{r} - (\underline{v} + v) \right) \cdot (\tilde{\rho}^2 + \sigma^2) \cdot w_\gamma.$$

In particular, using Lemma 3.2 and the range restriction $\frac{1}{2} \leq s \leq 1$ we have that this last expression is non-negative.

Moving on, we calculate the third term on the right hand side of (3.30). Using the bound (3.28) and the decomposition (2.25) we conclude that:

$$(3.37) \quad -\frac{1}{2} Q_{L\beta}[\tilde{F}] (\overline{K}_0^s)^\beta \cdot L(w_{\gamma,\epsilon}) \sim C_{\gamma,\epsilon}^{-1} \tau_0^{1+2\epsilon} (\tau_-^{2s} |\underline{\alpha}|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} (\tilde{\rho}^2 + \sigma^2)) \cdot w'_{\gamma,\epsilon}.$$

Similarly, using the bound (3.29) we estimate:

$$(3.38) \quad -\frac{1}{2} Q_{L\beta}[\tilde{F}] (\overline{K}_0^s)^\beta \cdot \underline{L}(w_{\gamma,\epsilon}) \sim C_{\gamma,\epsilon}^{-1} (\tau_+^{2s} |\alpha|^2 + \tau_-^{2s} (\tilde{\rho}^2 + \sigma^2)) \cdot w'_{\gamma,\epsilon}.$$

Therefore, collecting the positive terms (3.33)–(3.34) and (3.36)–(3.38) onto the right hand side of (3.31) above, and collecting (3.35) with (3.32) on the left hand side and using the shorthand notation (3.46), which will be introduced in a moment, we can estimate:

$$(3.39) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma} (|\tilde{E}|^2 + |H|^2) dx + \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\tilde{\rho}| \cdot |q| \cdot \tau_+^{-2} \tau_-^{-10} w_\gamma dx dt \\ & + \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\tau_+^{2s} (|\alpha| \cdot |\not{J}| + |\tilde{\rho}| \cdot |J_L|) + \tau_-^{2s} (|\underline{\alpha}| \cdot |\not{J}| + |\tilde{\rho}| \cdot |J_{\underline{L}}|) \right) \cdot w_\gamma dx dt \\ & \geq C_{\gamma,\epsilon}^{-1} \left[E^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0, t_0)[\tilde{F}] + \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\frac{\underline{v} - v}{r} - (\underline{v} + v) \right) \cdot (\tilde{\rho}^2 + \sigma^2) \cdot w_\gamma dx dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We now make a preliminary reduction on estimate (3.39) above by first discarding the second positive term on the right hand side, and then using a Cauchy–Schwartz to peel off a factor of $(E^{\frac{1}{2}})^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0, t_0)[\tilde{F}]$ from the latter two terms on the left hand side of the above expression. Setting:

$$(3.40) \quad |||J|||_{L^2[0,t_0](L^2)(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 = \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\tau_+^{2s} \tau_0^{-1-2\epsilon} \tau_- |J_L|^2 + \tau_0^{2s-1-2\epsilon} \tau_-^{2s+1} |J_{\underline{L}}|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} \tau_- |\not{J}|^2 \right) w_{\gamma,\epsilon} dx dt,$$

by a simple use of Hölders inequality, the condition $\epsilon \leq s - \frac{1}{2}$, and the weight bound $w_\gamma^2 \leq \tau_- w'_{\gamma,\epsilon} w_{\gamma,\epsilon}$ we may replace (3.39) with the estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} E^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0, t_0)[\tilde{F}] & \leq C_{\gamma,\epsilon} \left[(E^{\frac{1}{2}})^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0, t_0)[\tilde{F}] \cdot (|||J|||_{L^2[0,t_0](L^2)(s,\gamma,\epsilon)} + |q|) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma} (|\tilde{E}|^2 + |H|^2) dx \right], \end{aligned}$$

from which easily follows the bound:

$$(3.41) \quad E^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,t_0)[\tilde{F}] \leq C_{\gamma,\epsilon}^2 \left[\|J\|_{L^2[0,t_0](L^2)(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 + |q|^2 + \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma} (|\tilde{E}|^2 + |H|^2) dx \right],$$

In order to deduce (3.20) from (3.41), we need to prove the following bounds for the range $\frac{1}{2} < s \leq 1$ and $0 < \gamma$, where $s + \gamma < \frac{3}{2}$:

$$(3.42) \quad |q|^2 \leq C_\gamma \| (1+r)^{s+\gamma} J_0(0) \|_{L_x^{\frac{6}{5}}}^2,$$

and:

$$(3.43) \quad \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma} |\tilde{E}|^2 dx \leq C_\gamma \left[\int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma} |E^{df}|^2 dx + \| (1+r)^{s+\gamma} J_0(0) \|_{L_x^{\frac{6}{5}}}^2 \right].$$

The first of the above estimates, (3.42), follows from a simple application of Hölders inequality with the weight $(1+r)^{-s-\gamma}$ in the integral (3.6) at time $t=0$. Note that $\frac{1}{2} < s + \gamma$ because of our range restrictions so the resulting factor integral converges with a bound depending only on γ .

The second of the above estimates results from a Hodge decomposition and the weighted elliptic estimate (10.2) from Appendix 10. Expanding out $\tilde{E}$ on the left hand side we can bound:

$$\int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma} |\tilde{E}|^2 dx \leq 2 \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma} (|E^{df}|^2 + |E^{cf} - \overline{E}|^2) dx.$$

Introducing a potential function φ for E^{cf} as in line (3.5) above and recalling the definition (3.9) of $\overline{E}$, and using line (3.42) to estimate:

$$\int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma} \left| \frac{q(F)}{r} \nabla_x \chi^+(r-2) \right|^2 dx \leq C_\gamma |q(F)|^2 \leq C_\gamma \| (1+r)^{s+\gamma} J_0(0) \|_{L_x^{\frac{6}{5}}}^2,$$

we are reduced to proving the estimate:

$$(3.44) \quad \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma} \left| \nabla \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} J_0(0) + \frac{q(F)}{4\pi r} \chi^+(r-2) \right) \right|^2 dx \lesssim C_\gamma \| (1+r)^{s+\gamma} J_0(0) \|_{L_x^{\frac{6}{5}}}^2.$$

By using the usual $L^{\frac{6}{5}} \hookrightarrow L^2$ Sobolev embedding, as well as the bounds:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} \left| \nabla \left(\frac{q(F)}{4\pi r} \chi^+(r-2) \right) \right|^2 dx &\lesssim |q(F)|^2 \leq C_\gamma \| (1+r)^{s+\gamma} J_0(0) \|_{L_x^{\frac{6}{5}}}^2, \\ \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} r^{2(s+\gamma)} \left| \nabla \left(\frac{q(F)}{4\pi r} (1 - \chi^+(r-2)) \right) \right|^2 dx &\leq C_\gamma |q(F)|^2 \leq C_\gamma \| (1+r)^{s+\gamma} J_0(0) \|_{L_x^{\frac{6}{5}}}^2, \end{aligned}$$

the second of which follows from the condition $\frac{1}{2} < s + \gamma$, we are reduced to showing that:

$$(3.45) \quad \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} r^{2(s+\gamma)} \left| \nabla \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} J_0(0) + \frac{q(F)}{4\pi r} \right) \right|^2 dx \lesssim C_\gamma \| r^{s+\gamma} J_0(0) \|_{L_x^{\frac{6}{5}}}^2.$$

Using the definition (3.6) of $q(F)$, this is precisely the statement of (10.2) in Appendix 10. Notice that the condition $\frac{1}{2} < s + \gamma < \frac{3}{2}$ is enforced by assumption. This ends the proof of estimate (3.20). $\square$

We conclude this section with an important generalization of Proposition 3.1. This involves estimates for derivatives of the field strength $F_{\alpha\beta}$. As it turns out, the simple decomposition (3.12) is remarkably robust with respect to the operation of Lie differentiation. One can show that $\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F}_{\alpha\beta}$ satisfies bounds similar to (3.20) with the appropriate right hand side. This will be used in the sequel to show that the various components of the null decomposition of $\tilde{F}_{\alpha\beta}$ satisfy the expected L^∞ estimates. Together with the fact that $\bar{F}_{\alpha\beta}$ is given explicitly, these bounds will fully determine the point-wise behavior of the original field strength $F_{\alpha\beta}$. We will prove:

Proposition 3.3 (Generalized Morawetz estimate for derivatives of the electro-magnetic field). *Let $F_{\alpha\beta}$ be a two-form which satisfies the system (1.8) with current vector J_α , and let $q(F)$ and $\tilde{F}$ be the associated charge and remainder field strength defined by formulas (3.6) and (3.12) respectively. Furthermore, let $0 < \gamma, \epsilon$ and $\frac{1}{2} < s \leq 1$ be given parameters such that $s + \gamma < \frac{3}{2}$ and $\epsilon \leq s - \frac{1}{2}$. Define the weights $\tau_0, w_\gamma, w_{\gamma,\epsilon}, w'_{\gamma,\epsilon}$ as on lines (3.14)–(3.17) above. Next, define the generalized (not charge modified) Morawetz type energy content of a two-form F in the time slab $\{0 \leq t \leq t_0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3$ to be:*

$$(3.46) \quad \begin{aligned} E^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0, t_0)[F] &= \sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \cap \{t\}} (\tau_+^{2s} |\alpha|^2 + \tau_-^{2s} |\underline{\alpha}|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} (\rho^2 + \sigma^2)) w_\gamma dx \\ &+ \sup_u \int_{\{C(u)\} \cap \{0 \leq t \leq t_0\}} (\tau_+^{2s} |\alpha|^2 + \tau_-^{2s} (\rho^2 + \sigma^2)) w_\gamma dV_{C(u)} \\ &+ \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\tau_+^{2s} |\alpha|^2 + \tau_0^{1+2\epsilon} (\tau_-^{2s} |\underline{\alpha}|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} \rho^2 + \tau_+^{2s} \sigma^2)) w'_{\gamma,\epsilon} dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

Now, define the k^{th} weighted charge modified Morawetz energy:

$$(3.47) \quad E_k^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0, t_0)[F] = q^2(F) + \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} E^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0, t_0)[\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F}].$$

Then, recalling the vector norm $||| \cdot |||_{L^2[0,t_0](L^2)(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}$ from line (3.40) above, we have the following general energy estimate:

$$(3.48) \quad E_k^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,t_0)[F] \leq C_{\gamma,\epsilon}^2 \left[\sum_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \left(||| \mathcal{L}_X^I J |||_{L^2[0,t_0](L^2)(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \cap \{t=0\}} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma+|I|} (|\nabla_x^I E^{df}|^2 + |\nabla_x^I H|^2) dx + \|(1+r)^{s+\gamma+|I|} \nabla_x^I J_0(0)\|_{L_x^{\frac{6}{5}}}^2 \right) \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{|I| \leq k-1} \|(1+r)^{s+\gamma+|I|+1} \nabla_{t,x}^I J(0)\|_{L_x^2}^2 \right].$$

Here ∇_x and $\nabla_{t,x}$ denote the Lie derivatives of the covector J and the two-form F with respect to the spatial translation invariant fields $\{\partial_i\}$ and the full set of translation invariant fields $\{\partial_\alpha\}$ respectively.

Proof of estimate (3.48). The proof is essentially that of estimate (3.20) applied to the field $\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F}_{\alpha\beta}$ with some additional calculations at the end to wrap things up. First notice that by (2.11) and the fact that for any Lie derivative one has $[d, \mathcal{L}_X] = 0$, we have the following formula for $\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F}$ whenever $X \in \mathbb{L} \setminus \{S\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^\beta (\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F})_{\alpha\beta} &= (\mathcal{L}_X^I J)_\alpha - (\mathcal{L}_X^I \bar{J})_\alpha, \\ \nabla^\beta * (\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F}) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The effect of the Lie derivative $\mathcal{L}_S$ is equally easy to account for. In this case formula (2.11) gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^\beta (\mathcal{L}_S \tilde{F})_{\alpha\beta} &= (J - \bar{J})_\alpha + (\mathcal{L}_S J)_\alpha - (\mathcal{L}_S \bar{J})_\alpha, \\ \nabla^\beta * (\mathcal{L}_S \tilde{F}) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Using the above formulas and following the proof of (3.20) until line (3.39) yields the inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} E_k^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,t_0)[F] &\leq C_{\gamma,\epsilon} \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \left[|q(F)|^2 + ||| \mathcal{L}_X^I (J - \bar{J}) |||_{L^2[0,t_0](L^2)(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \cap \{t=0\}} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma} (|E(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F})|^2 + |H(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F})|^2) dx \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the same steps as at the end of the proof of (3.20) to bound the quantity $|q(F)|$, we are done once we have shown that:

$$(3.49) \quad ||| \mathcal{L}_X^I \bar{J} |||_{L^2[0,t_0](L^2)(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 \lesssim |q(F)|^2,$$

as well as the bound:

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.50) \quad & \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \cap \{t=0\}} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma} \left(|E(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F})|^2 + |H(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F})|^2 \right) dx \\
& \lesssim \sum_{|I| \leq k} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \cap \{t=0\}} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma+|I|} (|\nabla_x^I E^{df}|^2 + |\nabla_x^I H|^2) dx \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left\| (1+r)^{s+\gamma+|I|} \nabla_x^I J_0(0) \right\|_{L_x^{\frac{6}{5}}}^2 \right] \\
& \quad + \sum_{|I| \leq k-1} \left\| (1+r)^{s+\gamma+|I|+1} \nabla_{t,x}^I J(0) \right\|_{L_x^2}^2 .
\end{aligned}$$

We begin with (3.49). This will follow from direct computation using point-wise bounds on the quantity $\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{J}$ for $X \in \mathbb{L}$. These point-wise bounds will be provided through induction on the value $|I|$. Notice that when $|I| = 0$ we may write:

$$(3.51) \quad J_{\underline{L}} = q \cdot \frac{\Omega_{\underline{L}}(\omega)}{r^2} \cdot \chi(u) , \quad J_L = q \cdot \frac{\Omega_L(\omega)}{r^4} \cdot \chi(u) , \quad J_A = q \cdot \frac{\Omega_A(\omega)}{r^3} \cdot \chi(u) ,$$

where χ is a C^∞ and $O(1)$ bump function adapted to the origin $u = 0$ and the $\Omega_\alpha(\omega)$ are smooth function of the angular variable only. In particular, these satisfy inductive identities:

$$L(\Omega_\alpha) = \underline{L}(\Omega_\alpha) = 0 , \quad e_A(\Omega_\alpha) = \frac{1}{r} \tilde{\Omega}_\alpha .$$

where the $\tilde{\Omega}_\alpha$ have the same properties of the Ω_α . Also, notice that by direct computation one can substitute the decay rates (3.51) into the norm $||| \cdot |||_{L^2[0,t_0](L^2)(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2$ to achieve a bound in terms of $|q(F)|$. We now show that the schematics on line (3.51) are preserved after each round of Lie differentiating by inductively establishing the identities:

$$(3.52a) \quad (\mathcal{L}_X^I J)_{\underline{L}} = q \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{|I|} \frac{\Omega_{\underline{L},k}^I(\omega)}{r^{2+k}} \cdot (\chi_k)_{\underline{L}}^I(u) ,$$

$$(3.52b) \quad (\mathcal{L}_X^I J)_L = q \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{|I|} \frac{\Omega_{L,k}^I(\omega)}{r^{4+k}} \cdot (\chi_k)_L^I(u) ,$$

$$(3.52c) \quad (\mathcal{L}_X^I J)_A = q \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{|I|} \frac{\Omega_{A,k}^I(\omega)}{r^{3+k}} \cdot (\chi_k)_A^I(u) ,$$

where the $\Omega_{\alpha,k}^I$ and $(\chi_k)_\alpha^I$ depend on the specific combination and number of vector-fields, but have the same properties as the Ω_α and χ in line (3.51) above. Also, the product notation is symbolic and is used to denote a finite sum of products of functions with these properties. Assuming that (3.52) is true for $|I| = l-1$ it can be shown that (3.52) holds for $|I| = l$ through direct use of the identities (2.32)–(2.33) as well as the formula:

$$(\mathcal{L}_X J)_\alpha = X(J_\alpha) - J([X, e_\alpha]) .$$

We leave this as a straightforward, although rather tedious, exercise for the reader. Note that everything can be put in terms of the variables u, r, ω so the only thing to verify is the homogeneity claim with respect to the power of r .

It remains to prove the second bound (3.50) above. This is done in two separate steps. First of all, a direct computation involving the formula:

$$(\mathcal{L}_X \tilde{F})_{\alpha\beta} = X(\tilde{F}_{\alpha\beta}) - \tilde{F}([X, e_\alpha], e_\beta) - \tilde{F}(e_\alpha, [X, e_\beta]) ,$$

as well as the bracket identities (2.31a) and (2.31c) shows that at time $t = 0$ one has the point-wise bound:

$$\sum_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \left(|E(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F})|^2 + |H(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F})|^2 \right) \lesssim \sum_{|I| \leq k} (1+r^2)^{|I|} \left(|\nabla_{t,x}^I \tilde{E}|^2 + |\nabla_{t,x}^I H|^2 \right) ,$$

Using the field equations (1.10), this last line can be further reduced to the estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \left(|E(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F})|^2 + |H(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F})|^2 \right) &\lesssim \sum_{|I| \leq k} (1+r^2)^{|I|} \left(|\nabla_x^I \tilde{E}|^2 + |\nabla_x^I E^{df}|^2 + |\nabla_x^I H|^2 \right) \\ &+ \sum_{|I| \leq k-1} (1+r^2)^{|I|+1} \left(|\nabla_{t,x}^I J|^2 + |q(F)|^2 \cdot |\nabla_{t,x}^I (\chi^+)'|^2 \right) . \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying through by $(1+r^2)^{s+\gamma}$ and integrating this last line over $\mathbb{R}^3$, we have achieved the bound (3.50) modulo the estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|I| \leq k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \cap \{t=0\}} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma+|I|} |\nabla_x^I \tilde{E}|^2 dx &\lesssim \sum_{|I| \leq k} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \cap \{t=0\}} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma+|I|} |\nabla_x^I E^{df}|^2 dx \right. \\ &\left. + \left\| (1+r)^{s+\gamma+|I|} \nabla_x^I J_0(0) \right\|_{L^{\frac{6}{5}}}^2 \right) . \end{aligned}$$

Using essentially the same steps which were employed to reduce estimate (3.43) above to (3.45), this last line is a consequence of the following generalization of estimate (10.2) in the Appendix:

$$\begin{aligned} (3.53) \quad \sum_{|I| \leq k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} r^{2(s+\gamma+|I|)} \left| \nabla \nabla_x^I \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} J_0(0) + \frac{q}{4\pi r} \right) \right|^2 dx \\ \leq C_\gamma \sum_{|I| \leq k} \left\| r^{s+\gamma+|I|} \nabla_x^I J_0(0) \right\|_{L^{\frac{6}{5}}}^2 . \end{aligned}$$

Estimate (3.53) can be reduced to estimate (3.45) through a process of induction. To see this, we assume that $0 < |I|$ and integrate by parts a couple of times on the left hand side of (3.53). This yields:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{L.H.S.})(3.53) &= \sum_{|I| \leq k} \left((s+\gamma+|I|+1)(s+\gamma+|I|) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} r^{2(s+\gamma+|I|-1)} \left| \nabla_x^I \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} J_0(0) + \frac{q}{4\pi r} \right) \right|^2 dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} r^{2(s+\gamma+|I|)} (\nabla_x^I J_0(0)) \cdot \nabla_x^I \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} J_0(0) + \frac{q}{4\pi r} \right) dx \right) . \end{aligned}$$

Applying Cauchy-Schwartz and Hölders inequality to the right hand side of the above expression in conjunction with the $L^2 \hookrightarrow L^6$ Sobolev embedding and setting:

$$\begin{aligned} A(k) &= \sum_{|I| \leq k} \| r^{s+\gamma+|I|} \nabla \nabla_x^J \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} J_0(0) + \frac{q}{4\pi r} \right) \|_{L^2} , \\ B(k) &= \sum_{|I| \leq k} \| r^{s+\gamma+|I|} \nabla_x^I J_0(0) \|_{L^{\frac{6}{5}}} , \end{aligned}$$

we have for $1 \leq k$ the estimate:

$$(3.54) \quad |(\text{L.H.S.})(3.53)| \sim A^2(k) \lesssim A^2(k-1) + B(k) \cdot (A(k) + A(k-1)) .$$

Notice that with this notation estimate (10.2) reads $A(0) \lesssim B(0)$. This assumption, together with the inductive estimate (3.54) shows that $A(k) \lesssim B(k)$ for all $0 \leq k$. This ends the proof of (3.53) and therefore the proof of (3.48). $\square$

4. FIXED TIME AND SPACE-TIME ENERGY ESTIMATES FOR COMPLEX SCALAR FIELDS: CONFORMAL MODIFICATIONS AND THE MORAWETZ THEORY

In this section, we prove estimates of the type (3.20) for the complex scalar field (1.2). This is necessarily more involved than in Section 3 because the tensor (1.13) is not trace-free which is a reflection of the fact that, unlike Maxwell's equations, the scalar wave equation is not conformally invariant. However, it is well known that there is an analog of the estimate (3.4) for the wave equation which is also known as the Morawetz estimate, and was first used in [13] to prove local energy decay for solutions to (1.13) in the case $F \equiv 0$. We record this estimate here as:

$$\begin{aligned} (4.1) \quad \int_{\{t=t_0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} \tau_+^2 |L\phi|^2 + \tau_-^2 |\underline{L}\phi|^2 + (\tau_+^2 + \tau_-^2) (|\nabla \phi|^2 + |\frac{\phi}{r}|^2) dx \\ \lesssim \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} (1 + r^2) |\nabla \phi|^2 dx . \end{aligned}$$

Notice that we have used the usual derivatives above because we are assuming that the connection is flat. The usual procedure for proving (4.1) involves first coming up with a certain weighted L^2 type identity, again known as the Morawetz identity, and then performing several integration by parts in order to ultimately arrive at the estimate (4.1). In the context we are working in, where we wish to prove energy estimates of the type (3.20) involving fractional weights as well as characteristic and space-time energy estimates, such a procedure would become unduly tedious. Therefore, we provide here a new approach to Morawetz type estimates which provides (4.1) directly in divergence form. Having done this, it will be straight forward to modify our divergence identity to include various weights of the type (3.15)–(3.17) as well as the fractional Morawetz field (3.21). Furthermore, our procedure leads to a more direct geometric insight as to the nature of (4.1) which is obscured by the usual integration by parts proof.

Our starting point is to conformally modify the Minkowski metric $g_{\alpha\beta}$ in such a way that the scalar field equation (1.2) is preserved. As is well known, if one

performs the conformal change of metric:

$$\tilde{g} = \frac{1}{\Omega^2} g ,$$

for some weight function Ω on $\mathcal{M}$, then any solution ϕ to the inhomogeneous equation:

$$(4.2) \quad \square^{\mathbb{C}} \phi = G ,$$

will transform to $\psi = \Omega \phi$, where ψ is a solution to the inhomogeneous conformal scalar field equation:

$$(4.3) \quad \widetilde{\square^{\mathbb{C}}} \psi - \frac{1}{6} \tilde{R} \psi = \Omega^3 G .$$

Here $\widetilde{\square^{\mathbb{C}}}$ is the covariant wave equation on the space $\tilde{M} \times \mathbb{C}$ with connections $(\tilde{\nabla}, \tilde{D})$ and $\tilde{R}$ the corresponding scalar curvature. One readily calculates that:

$$(4.4) \quad \tilde{R} = 6 \Omega^3 \nabla^\alpha \nabla_\alpha \left(\frac{1}{\Omega} \right) .$$

In order that (4.3) match up with (4.2), we require Ω to be such that the scalar curvature vanishes, $\tilde{R} \equiv 0$. In light of the calculation (4.4), this will be guaranteed if one has $\square(\frac{1}{\Omega}) = 0$ where $\square$ is the usual D’Lambertian on Minkowski space. There are two interesting and useful choices of Ω which give a singular solution to this problem and which are ultimately responsible for the estimate (4.1). These come from the fundamental solutions to the Laplace and wave equation respectively:

$${}^I\Omega = r, \quad {}^H\Omega = \underline{u}\underline{u} .$$

We label the resulting conformal metrics by ${}^I\tilde{g}$ and ${}^H\tilde{g}$ respectively. Notice that both of these metrics are singular along the varieties $r = 0$ and $|t| = r$ respectively. However, these singularities will not effect what we do here because there will always be extra factors involving positive powers of Ω in all the identities we use which will cancel the singularities off. A striking property of the metrics ${}^I\tilde{g}$ and ${}^H\tilde{g}$ is that the vector-field K_0 becomes Killing with respect to *both* of them (away from the singular set of course). This is seen simply from the identities:

$$K_0 \left(\frac{1}{r^2} \right) = -\frac{4t}{r^2} , \quad K_0 \left(\frac{1}{(\underline{u}\underline{u})^2} \right) = -\frac{4t}{(\underline{u}\underline{u})^2} .$$

Thus, for example one has that:

$$(4.5) \quad \mathcal{L}_{K_0} {}^I\tilde{g} = K_0 \left(\frac{1}{r^2} \right) g + \frac{1}{r^2} \mathcal{L}_{K_0} g = 0 ,$$

with a similar calculation showing that:

$$(4.6) \quad \mathcal{L}_{K_0} {}^H\tilde{g} = 0 .$$

Note that the vector-field T is Killing with respect to ${}^I\tilde{g}$, but is only conformal Killing with respect to ${}^H\tilde{g}$. The identities (4.5)–(4.6) show that if one is to use the vector-field K_0 to produce energy estimates, it is best done with respect to the metrics ${}^I\tilde{g}$ and ${}^H\tilde{g}$ instead of the usual Minkowski. Accordingly, we define the *conformal energy-momentum tensors of the first and second kind* associated to (4.2)

to simply be the usual energy-momentum tensors of the equation (4.3) with respect to the metrics ${}^I\tilde{g}$ and ${}^II\tilde{g}$ and the appropriately transformed solutions:

$$(4.7) \quad {}^I\tilde{Q}_{\alpha\beta}[\phi] = \Re(D_\alpha(r\phi)\overline{D_\beta(r\phi)}) - \frac{1}{2}{}^I\tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}\tilde{D}^\gamma(r\phi)\overline{D_\gamma(r\phi)},$$

$$(4.8) \quad {}^II\tilde{Q}_{\alpha\beta}[\phi] = \Re(D_\alpha(u\underline{u}\phi)\overline{D_\beta(u\underline{u}\phi)}) - \frac{1}{2}{}^II\tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}\tilde{D}^\gamma(u\underline{u}\phi)\overline{D_\gamma(u\underline{u}\phi)}.$$

Here we have used the notation $\tilde{D}^\gamma = \tilde{g}^{\alpha\gamma}D_\alpha$ for $\tilde{g} = {}^I\tilde{g}, {}^II\tilde{g}$ on lines (4.7) and (4.8) respectively. As a direct consequence of the equation (4.3) and the divergence-free property of the energy-momentum tensor for scalar fields one has the divergence laws:

$$(4.9) \quad {}^I\tilde{\nabla}^\alpha {}^I\tilde{Q}_{\alpha\beta}[\phi] = r^4 \left(\Re(G \cdot \overline{\frac{1}{r}D_\beta(r\phi)}) + F_{\beta\gamma}\Im(\phi \overline{\frac{1}{r}D^\gamma(r\phi)}) \right),$$

$$(4.10) \quad {}^II\tilde{\nabla}^\alpha {}^II\tilde{Q}_{\alpha\beta}[\phi] = (u\underline{u})^4 \left(\Re(G \cdot \overline{\frac{1}{u\underline{u}}D_\beta(u\underline{u}\phi)}) + F_{\beta\gamma}\Im(\phi \overline{\frac{1}{u\underline{u}}D^\gamma(u\underline{u}\phi)}) \right),$$

where ${}^I\tilde{\nabla}$ and ${}^II\tilde{\nabla}$ are the Levi-Civita connections of ${}^I\tilde{g}$ and ${}^II\tilde{g}$ respectively. Since the vector-field K_0 is Killing with respect to both of these metrics we may contract it with the tensors (4.7)–(4.8) to obtain momentum densities which satisfy the divergence laws:

$$(4.11) \quad {}^I\tilde{\nabla}^\alpha \left({}^I\tilde{Q}_{\alpha\beta}[\phi](K_0)^\beta \right) = r^4 \left(\Re(G \cdot \overline{\frac{1}{r}D_{K_0}(r\phi)}) + (K_0)^\beta F_{\beta\gamma}\Im(\phi \overline{D^\gamma\phi}) \right),$$

$$(4.12) \quad {}^II\tilde{\nabla}^\alpha \left({}^II\tilde{Q}_{\alpha\beta}[\phi](K_0)^\beta \right) = (u\underline{u})^4 \left(\Re(G \cdot \overline{\frac{1}{u\underline{u}}D_{K_0}(u\underline{u}\phi)}) + (K_0)^\beta F_{\beta\gamma}\Im(\phi \overline{\frac{1}{u\underline{u}}D^\gamma(u\underline{u}\phi)}) \right).$$

These last two identities can now be integrated over various space-time regions to obtain positive quantities for the scalar field ϕ at the cost of estimating the source terms on the right hand side of (4.11)–(4.12). To calculate these, notice that the volume forms of the metrics ${}^I\tilde{g}$ and ${}^II\tilde{g}$ are:

$$(4.13) \quad dV_I = \frac{1}{r^4}dV_{\mathcal{M}}, \quad dV_{II} = \frac{1}{(u\underline{u})^4}dV_{\mathcal{M}},$$

while rT and $u\underline{u}T$ are the respective Lorentzian unit normals to the time slices $t = \text{const}$. Furthermore, notice that the vector-fields rL and $u\underline{u}L$ are the respective Lorentzian unit normal to the cones $u = \text{const}$. Therefore, applying the geometric Stokes theorem to with respect to these quantities, we arrive at the basic Morawetz type energy estimates for the complex scalar field (4.2):

Proposition 4.1 (First and Second Morawetz Estimates for Complex Scalar Fields). *Let $\Omega = r, u\bar{u}$. Then one has the following estimates for solutions to the inhomogeneous equation (4.2):*

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.14) \quad & \int_{\{t=t_0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{4} \left(\underline{u}^2 \left| \frac{1}{\Omega} D_L(\Omega\phi) \right|^2 + u^2 \left| \frac{1}{\Omega} D_{\underline{L}}(\Omega\phi) \right|^2 + (\underline{u}^2 + u^2) |\mathcal{P}\phi|^2 \right) dx \\
 & + \sup_u \int_{C(u) \cap \{0 < t < t_0\}} \frac{1}{4} \left(\underline{u}^2 \left| \frac{1}{\Omega} D_L(\Omega\phi) \right|^2 + u^2 |\mathcal{P}\phi|^2 \right) dV_{C(u)} \\
 & \leq \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |G \cdot \frac{1}{\Omega} D_{K_0}(\Omega\phi)| + |(K_0)^\beta F_{\beta\gamma} \Im(\phi \frac{1}{\Omega} D^\gamma(\Omega\phi))| dx dt \\
 & \quad + \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} \frac{r^2}{2} \left| \frac{1}{\Omega} D(\Omega\phi) \right|^2 dx .
 \end{aligned}$$

To derive (4.1) from estimate (4.14) above is a simple matter. Assume now that both $G = F \equiv 0$. Notice first that it suffices to prove (4.1) with the τ_+, τ_- weights replaced by $\underline{u}, u$ and $(1+r^2)$ on the right hand side replaced by r^2 . This follows at once from expanding the usual energy identity in a null frame, and using the fixed time Poincare inequality:

$$(4.15) \quad \int_{\{t=const.\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right|^2 dx \lesssim \int_{\{t=const.\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} |\partial_r \phi|^2 dx ,$$

to deal with the non-differentiated term. To deal with the homogeneous version of estimate (4.1), we simply use the identities:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \underline{u}^2 \left| \frac{1}{r} L(r\phi) \right|^2 &= \left| \underline{u} L\phi + \frac{\underline{u}\phi}{r} \right|^2 , & u^2 \left| \frac{1}{r} \underline{L}(r\phi) \right|^2 &= \left| u \underline{L}\phi - \frac{u\phi}{r} \right|^2 , \\
 \underline{u}^2 \left| \frac{1}{u\bar{u}} L(u\bar{u}\phi) \right|^2 &= \left| \underline{u} L\phi + 2\phi \right|^2 , & u^2 \left| \frac{1}{u\bar{u}} \underline{L}(u\bar{u}\phi) \right|^2 &= \left| u \underline{L}\phi + 2\phi \right|^2 .
 \end{aligned}$$

together with:

$$(4.16) \quad \frac{-u\phi}{r} = (\underline{u} L\phi + 2\phi) - (\underline{u} L\phi + \frac{\underline{u}\phi}{r}) ,$$

$$(4.17) \quad \frac{\underline{u}\phi}{r} = (u \underline{L}\phi + 2\phi) - (u \underline{L}\phi - \frac{u\phi}{r}) ,$$

which collectively imply the two pointwise estimates:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \underline{u}^2 |L\phi|^2 + u^2 |\underline{L}\phi|^2 &\leq 2 \left(\underline{u}^2 \left| \frac{1}{r} L(r\phi) \right|^2 + u^2 \left| \frac{1}{r} \underline{L}(r\phi) \right|^2 \right) + 2 (\underline{u}^2 + u^2) \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right|^2 , \\
 (\underline{u}^2 + u^2) \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right|^2 &\leq 2 \sum_{\Omega=r, u\bar{u}} \underline{u}^2 \left| \frac{1}{\Omega} L(\Omega\phi) \right|^2 + u^2 \left| \frac{1}{\Omega} \underline{L}(\Omega\phi) \right|^2 .
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining these last two, we have completed our demonstration of (4.1).

We now prove a fractionally weighted and space-time generalization of (4.14) which will be our analog of estimate (3.20) for the complex scalar field (4.2). This is:

Proposition 4.2 (Generalized Morawetz Estimate for Complex Scalar Fields). *Let ϕ be a complex scalar field which satisfies the equation (4.2), and let F be the*

curvature of the corresponding connection. Let $0 < \epsilon, \gamma$ be given parameters, and let s be chosen so that $\frac{1}{2} \leq s \leq 1$ as well as $\epsilon \leq s - \frac{1}{2}$. Define the weights $\tau_0, w_\gamma, w_{\gamma, \epsilon}$, and w'_γ as on lines (3.14)–(3.17). Also, define the generalized Morawetz type energy content of ϕ in the time slab $\{0 \leq t \leq t_0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3$:

$$(4.18) \quad \begin{aligned} & E_0^{(\epsilon, \gamma, s)}(0, t_0)[\phi] , \\ &= \sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} \int_{\{t\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} \left(\tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right|^2 + \tau_-^{2s} |D_{\underline{L}}\phi|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} \left(|\mathcal{D}\phi|^2 + \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right|^2 \right) \right) w_\gamma \, dx , \\ &+ \sup_u \int_{C(u) \cap \{0 \leq t \leq t_0\}} \left(\tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right|^2 + \tau_-^{2s} |\mathcal{D}\phi|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{u\phi}{\underline{u}r} \right|^2 \right) w_\gamma \, dV_{C(u)} , \\ &+ \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right|^2 + \tau_0^{1+2\epsilon} \left(\tau_-^{2s} |D_{\underline{L}}\phi|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} |\mathcal{D}\phi|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right|^2 \right) \right) w'_{\gamma, \epsilon} \, dx dt . \end{aligned}$$

Then one has the following general weighted energy type inequality:

$$(4.19) \quad \begin{aligned} E_0^{(\epsilon, \gamma, s)}(0, t_0)[\phi] &\leq C_{\epsilon, \gamma}^2 \left[||| F |||_{L^\infty[0, t_0](\epsilon)}^2 \cdot E_0^{(\epsilon, \gamma, s)}(0, t_0)[\phi] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tau_+^{2s} \tau_- |G|^2 w_{\gamma, \epsilon} \, dx dt + \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma} |D(\phi)|^2 \, dx \right] , \end{aligned}$$

where we have set $||| F |||_{L^\infty[0, t_0](\epsilon)}$ equal to the time-slab L^∞ type norm:

$$(4.20) \quad ||| F |||_{L^\infty[0, t_0](\epsilon)} = \sup_{\substack{0 \leq t \leq t_0 \\ x \in \{t\} \times \mathbb{R}^3}} \left(\tau_+^2 \tau_0^{-2\epsilon} |\alpha| + \tau_+^{\frac{3}{2}} \tau_-^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau_0^{-\epsilon} |\rho| + \tau_+ \tau_- |\underline{\alpha}| \right) \cdot w_{\gamma, \epsilon} (w_\gamma)^{-1} .$$

In particular, if we further define the multiindexed L^∞ norm for electro-magnetic fields:

$$(4.21) \quad \begin{aligned} ||| F |||_{L^\infty[0, t_0](s, \gamma, \epsilon)}^2 &= \sup_{\substack{0 \leq t \leq t_0 \\ x \in \{t\} \times \mathbb{R}^3}} \left(\tau_+^{2s+3} |\alpha|^2 + \tau_+^2 \tau_-^{2s+1} |\underline{\alpha}|^2 + \tau_+^{2s+2} \tau_- (\tilde{\rho}^2 + \sigma^2) \right) \cdot w_\gamma \\ &\quad + |q(F)|^2 + \|\tau_+^{s+1} \tau_-^{\frac{1}{2}} (w')_{\gamma, \epsilon} \alpha\|_{L^2(L^\infty)[0, t_0]}^2 , \end{aligned}$$

where the quantity $q(F)$ is defined as on line (3.6), then under the more restrictive condition that $4\epsilon \leq s - \frac{1}{2}$ we have the bound:

$$(4.22) \quad ||| F |||_{L^\infty[0, t_0](\epsilon)} \leq ||| F |||_{L^\infty[0, t_0](s, \gamma, \epsilon)} .$$

In particular, the estimate (4.19) remains valid with (4.20) replaced by (4.21).

Remark 4.3. Comparing estimate (3.20) with (4.19) we see that there is a close analogy, at least with respect to energy estimates, between the various null components of F and the gradient $D\phi$. Schematically, these are:

$$(4.23) \quad \alpha \sim \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) , \quad \underline{\alpha} \sim D_{\underline{L}}\phi ,$$

$$(4.24) \quad \sigma \sim \mathcal{D}\phi , \quad \tilde{\rho} \sim \frac{\phi}{r} .$$

As we shall see in the following two sections, this analogy persists in the discussion of L^∞ type estimates. We will make solid of this in the sequel, where we will use the analogy (4.23)–(4.24) to reduce the field equations (1.17) and its commutators to a equation for a single abstract vector quantity Ψ which has weighted energy and peeling properties equal to the null decompositions of F and $D\phi$.

Remark 4.4. Note that the L^∞ norm (4.21) contains several terms not present in the original L^∞ norm (4.20). Since the more involved norm will be used exclusively in the sequel, we have stated it here for future reference. Also, notice that on line (4.22) we have used the formulas (3.12) and (3.10) for the subtracted charge $\tilde{\rho}$. Note that this bound (for the charge) becomes sharp in the far exterior $r - t \sim r$.

Proof of estimate (4.19). The proof is nearly identical to that of (3.20) in the previous section. Our first step is to come up with a fractionally weighted momentum density associated with the first conformal metric ${}^I\tilde{g}$. We define this to be:

$$(4.25) \quad {}^I\tilde{P}_\alpha^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] = {}^I\tilde{Q}_{\alpha\beta}[\phi](\overline{K}_0^s)^\beta \cdot \tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon} ,$$

where $\tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon}$ is the weight function from line (3.26). This satisfies the divergence law:

$$(4.26) \quad \begin{aligned} {}^I\tilde{\nabla}^\alpha {}^I\tilde{P}_\alpha^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] &= r^4 \left(\Re(G \cdot \overline{\frac{1}{r}D_{\overline{K}_0^s}(r\phi)}) + (\overline{K}_0^s)^\beta F_{\beta\gamma} \Im(\phi \overline{D^\gamma \phi}) \right) \cdot \tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} {}^I\tilde{Q}_{\alpha\beta}[\phi] (\overline{K}_0^s)^\alpha \tilde{\pi}^{\beta\gamma} \cdot \tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon} \\ &\quad - \frac{r^2}{2} {}^I\tilde{Q}_{\underline{L}\beta}[\phi] (\overline{K}_0^s)^\beta \cdot L(\tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon}) - \frac{r^2}{2} {}^I\tilde{Q}_{L\beta}[\phi] (\overline{K}_0^s)^\beta \cdot \underline{L}(\tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon}) . \end{aligned}$$

Integrating both sides of the above expression with respect to the volume $dV_I = r^{-4}dV_{\mathcal{M}}$ over regions of the form:

$$\mathcal{R}(t_0, u_0) = \{0 \leq t \leq t_0\} \cap \{u \leq u_0\} ,$$

and noting that rT and rL are the respective Lorentzian unit normals to the time slices $t = \text{const.}$ and cones $u = \text{const.}$, we arrive at the following integral identity:

$$(4.27) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \{-u_0 \leq r\}} r^{-2} {}^I\tilde{P}_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] dx &= \int_{\{t=t_0\} \cap \{t_0 - u_0 \leq r\}} r^{-2} {}^I\tilde{P}_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] dx \\ + \int_{C(u_0) \cap \{0 \leq t \leq t_0\}} r^{-2} {}^I\tilde{P}_L^{s,\gamma,\epsilon}[\phi] dV_{C(u_0)} &+ \int \int_{\mathcal{R}(t_0, u_0)} r^{-4} (\text{R.H.S.})(4.26) dx dt . \end{aligned}$$

We now calculate each term in (4.26) individually. We will use the same $\sim$ notation as in the proof of (3.20). At time $t = 0$, we compute that:

$$(4.28) \quad r^{-2} {}^I\tilde{P}_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] \sim (1 + r^2)^{s+\gamma} \left| \frac{1}{r} D(r\phi) \right|^2 .$$

Likewise, at time $t = t_0$ we have that:

$$(4.29) \quad r^{-2} {}^I\tilde{P}_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] \sim \left(\tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right|^2 + \tau_-^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_{\underline{L}}(r\phi) \right|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} |\not{D}\phi|^2 \right) \cdot w_\gamma ,$$

and on the cone $u_0 = \text{const.}$ we have:

$$(4.30) \quad r^{-2} {}^I \tilde{P}_L^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] \sim \left(\tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right|^2 + \tau_-^{2s} |\mathcal{D}\phi|^2 \right) \cdot w_\gamma.$$

It remains to calculate the expression $r^{-4}(\text{R.H.S.})(4.26)$. We do this for each term separately. Since the first such term does not have a sign, we put absolute value signs around it and estimate:

$$(4.31) \quad \left| \Re \left(G \cdot \overline{\frac{1}{r} D_{\overline{K}_0^s}(r\phi)} \right) \right| \lesssim |G| \cdot \left(\tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right| + \tau_-^{2s} |D_{\underline{L}}\phi| + \tau_-^{2s} \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \right),$$

$$(4.32) \quad \begin{aligned} |(\overline{K}_0^s)^\beta F_{\beta\gamma} \Im(\phi \overline{D^\gamma \phi})| &\lesssim \tau_+^{2s+1} \left(|\alpha| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot |\mathcal{D}\phi| + |\rho| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right| \right) \\ &\quad + \tau_+ \tau_-^{2s} \left(|\underline{\alpha}| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot |\mathcal{D}\phi| + |\rho| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot |D_{\underline{L}}\phi| \right). \end{aligned}$$

To calculate the second term on the right hand side of expression (4.26) we need to compute the deformation tensor $(\overline{K}_0^s) \widetilde{\pi}_{\alpha\beta}$. Using the identities (2.3) and (3.22) this is:

$$\begin{aligned} (\overline{K}_0^s) \widetilde{\pi} &= \overline{K}_0^s \left(\frac{1}{r^2} \right) g + \frac{1}{r^2} (\overline{K}_0^s) \pi, \\ &= \frac{2}{r^2} \left(\frac{v-v}{r} - (\dot{v} + \dot{v}) \right) (\theta^{\underline{L}} \otimes \theta^L + \theta^L \otimes \theta^{\underline{L}}). \end{aligned}$$

Contracting this last line with $\frac{1}{2} r^{-4} {}^I \tilde{Q}[\phi] \cdot \widetilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon}$ yields:

$$(4.33) \quad \frac{1}{2} r^{-4} {}^I \tilde{Q}_{\alpha\beta}[\phi] (\overline{K}_0^s) \widetilde{\pi}^{\alpha\beta} \cdot \widetilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon} \sim \left(\frac{v-v}{r} - (\dot{v} + \dot{v}) \right) \cdot |\mathcal{D}\phi|^2 \cdot w_\gamma.$$

In particular, we see that this term only contributes a positive addition to the right hand side of (4.26). To compute the last two terms of $r^{-4}(\text{R.H.S.})(4.26)$, we simply use the calculations (3.28)–(3.29) and the expansions (2.26) to conclude that:

$$(4.34) \quad -\frac{1}{2} r^{-2} {}^I \tilde{Q}_{\underline{L}\beta}[\phi] (\overline{K}_0^s)^\beta \cdot L(\widetilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon}) \sim C_{\gamma,\epsilon}^{-1} \tau_0^{1+\epsilon} \left(\tau_-^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_{\underline{L}}(r\phi) \right|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} |\mathcal{D}\phi|^2 \right) \cdot w'_{\gamma,\epsilon},$$

$$(4.35) \quad -\frac{1}{2} r^{-2} {}^I \tilde{Q}_{L\beta}[\phi] (\overline{K}_0^s)^\beta \cdot \underline{L}(\widetilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon}) \sim C_{\gamma,\epsilon}^{-1} \left(\tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right|^2 + \tau_-^{2s} |\mathcal{D}\phi|^2 \right) \cdot w'_{\gamma,\epsilon}.$$

Now, inserting the terms (4.28)–(4.35) in the identity (4.27) and removing the positive contribution (4.33) from the right hand side of the resulting estimate, we

arrive at our first preliminary estimate to (4.19):

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.36) \quad & \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma} \left| \frac{1}{r} D(r\phi) \right|^2 dx + \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |G| \cdot \left(\tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right| + \tau_-^{2s} |D_{\underline{L}}\phi| + \tau_-^{2s} \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \right) \cdot w_\gamma dx dt \\
& \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tau_+^{2s+1} \left(|\alpha| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot |\mathcal{D}\phi| + |\rho| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right| \right) \cdot w_\gamma dx dt \\
& + \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tau_+ \tau_-^{2s} \left(|\underline{\alpha}| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot |\mathcal{D}\phi| + |\rho| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot |D_{\underline{L}}\phi| \right) \cdot w_\gamma dx dt \\
& \geq C_{\gamma,\epsilon}^{-1} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} \int_{\{t\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} \left(\tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right|^2 + \tau_-^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_{\underline{L}}(r\phi) \right|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} |\mathcal{D}\phi|^2 \right) \cdot w_\gamma dx \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sup_u \int_{C(u) \cap \{0 \leq t \leq t_0\}} \left(\tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right|^2 + \tau_-^{2s} |\mathcal{D}\phi|^2 \right) \cdot w_\gamma dV_{C(u)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right|^2 + \tau_0^{1+\epsilon} \left(\tau_-^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_{\underline{L}}(r\phi) \right|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} |\mathcal{D}\phi|^2 \right) \right) \cdot w'_{\gamma,\epsilon} dx dt \right].
\end{aligned}$$

By repeating the above steps with the density (4.25) replaced by the following weighted version of the usual energy density for ϕ :

$$P_\alpha^{(\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] = Q_{\alpha\beta}[\phi](T)^\beta \cdot \tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon},$$

and using the bounds:

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.37) \quad & |\Re(G \cdot \overline{D_T \phi})| \lesssim (\text{L.H.S})(4.31), \\
& |F_{0\gamma} \Im(\phi \overline{D^\gamma \phi})| \lesssim (\text{L.H.S})(4.32)
\end{aligned}$$

we also have the estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.38) \quad & (\text{R.H.S.})(4.36) \geq C_{\gamma,\epsilon}^{-1} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} \int_{\{t\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} |D_{\underline{L}}\phi|^2 \cdot w_\gamma dx \right. \\
& \left. + \sup_u \int_{C(u) \cap \{0 \leq t \leq t_0\}} |D_L\phi|^2 \cdot w_\gamma dV_{C(u)} + \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tau_0^{1+\epsilon} |D_{\underline{L}}\phi|^2 \cdot w'_{\gamma,\epsilon} dx dt \right].
\end{aligned}$$

By adding together estimates (4.36)–(4.38), we have almost achieved the statement of estimate (4.19). What is missing from the right hand side are terms involving the weighted quantity $\underline{u}^{2s} \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right|$. As with estimate (4.14), bounds on this quantity will come from integrating a divergence identity involving the tensor (4.8) and then combining the resulting estimate with (4.36) above. To do this, we form the second weighted momentum density:

$$(4.39) \quad {}^H \tilde{P}_\alpha^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] = {}^H \tilde{Q}_{\alpha\beta}[\phi](K_0)^\beta \cdot \tilde{w}_{s,\gamma,\epsilon},$$

where the weight function $\tilde{w}_{s,\gamma,\epsilon}$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.40) \quad \tilde{w}_{s,\gamma,\epsilon} = & (1 + \underline{u})^{2s-2} \cdot ((2-u)^{2\gamma} \chi^+(-u) + 1 - \chi^+(-u)) \\
& + (1 + \underline{u})^{2s-2-2\epsilon} \cdot ((2-u)^{2\gamma+2\epsilon} \chi^+(-u) + 1 - \chi^+(-u))
\end{aligned}$$

We now follow through the same steps used to prove (4.36) above. Computing the divergence of (4.39) we have that:

$$(4.41) \quad \begin{aligned} {}^{\Pi} \widetilde{\nabla}^{\alpha} {}^{\Pi} \widetilde{P}_{\alpha}^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] &= (u\underline{u})^4 \left(\Re(G \cdot \overline{\frac{1}{u\underline{u}} D_{K_0}(u\underline{u}\phi)}) + (K_0)^{\beta} F_{\beta\gamma} \Im(\phi \overline{D^{\gamma}\phi}) \right) \cdot \widetilde{w}_{s,\gamma,\epsilon} \\ &\quad - \frac{(u\underline{u})^2}{2} {}^{\Pi} \widetilde{Q}_{L\beta}[\phi] (K_0)^{\beta} \cdot L(\widetilde{w}_{s,\gamma,\epsilon}) - \frac{(u\underline{u})^2}{2} {}^{\Pi} \widetilde{Q}_{L\beta}[\phi] (K_0)^{\beta} \cdot \underline{L}(\widetilde{w}_{s,\gamma,\epsilon}) . \end{aligned}$$

Integrating this expression with respect to the volume $dV_{\Pi} = (u\underline{u})^{-4} dV_{\mathcal{M}}$ and using the Stokes theorem we arrive at the integral identity:

$$(4.42) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \{-u_0 \leq r\}} (u\underline{u})^{-2} {}^{\Pi} \widetilde{P}_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] dx &= \int_{\{t=t_0\} \cap \{t_0 - u_0 \leq r\}} (u\underline{u})^{-2} {}^{\Pi} \widetilde{P}_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] dx \\ + \int_{C(u_0) \cap \{0 \leq t \leq t_0\}} (u\underline{u})^{-2} {}^{\Pi} \widetilde{P}_L^{s,\gamma,\epsilon}[\phi] dV_{C(u_0)} &+ \int \int_{\mathcal{R}(t_0, u_0)} (u\underline{u})^{-4} (\text{R.H.S.})(4.41) dx dt . \end{aligned}$$

We now compute in turn each term in (4.42) above. When $t = 0$ we have that:

$$(4.43) \quad (u\underline{u})^{-2} {}^{\Pi} \widetilde{P}_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] \sim r^{2(s+\gamma)} \left| \frac{1}{r^2} D(r^2 \phi) \right|^2 .$$

Likewise, at time $t = t_0$ and along the cone $u = \text{const.}$ we compute that:

$$(4.44) \quad (u\underline{u})^{-2} {}^{\Pi} \widetilde{P}_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] \sim \left(\tau_+^{2s-2} \underline{u}^2 \left| \frac{1}{u\underline{u}} D_L(u\underline{u}\phi) \right|^2 + \tau_+^{2s-2} u^2 \left| \frac{1}{u\underline{u}} D_{\underline{L}}(u\underline{u}\phi) \right|^2 + \tau_+^{2s-2} \underline{u}^2 |\not{D}\phi|^2 \right) \cdot w_{\gamma} ,$$

$$(4.45) \quad (u\underline{u})^{-2} {}^{\Pi} \widetilde{P}_L^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] \sim \left(\tau_+^{2s-2} \underline{u}^2 \left| \frac{1}{u\underline{u}} D_L(u\underline{u}\phi) \right|^2 + \tau_+^{2s-2} u^2 |\not{D}\phi|^2 \right) \cdot w_{\gamma} .$$

We now turn our attention to the terms in the expression $(u\underline{u})^{-4} (\text{R.H.S.})(4.41)$. First, using the identities (4.16)–(4.17) with $L, \underline{L}$ replaced by $D_L, D_{\underline{L}}$ we conclude that:

$$\begin{aligned} |\underline{u} D_L \phi + 2\phi| &\leq \underline{u} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right| + u \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| , \\ |u D_{\underline{L}} \phi + 2\phi| &\leq u |D_{\underline{L}} \phi| + 2\underline{u} \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| . \end{aligned}$$

This then implies that one may estimate:

$$(4.46) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| \Re(G \cdot \overline{\frac{1}{u\underline{u}} D_{K_0}(u\underline{u}\phi)}) \right| \cdot \widetilde{w}_{s,\gamma,\epsilon} &\lesssim |G| \cdot \left(\tau_+^{2s-1} |\underline{u} D_L \phi + 2\phi| + \tau_+^{2s-2} u |u D_{\underline{L}} \phi + 2\phi| \right) \cdot w_{\gamma} , \\ &\lesssim |G| \cdot \left(\tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right| + \tau_+^{2s} |D_{\underline{L}} \phi| + \tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{u\phi}{\underline{u}r} \right| \right) \cdot w_{\gamma} . \end{aligned}$$

To bound the second term on the right hand side of (4.41) above, we simply use the estimate (4.32) noting that one may trade $\tau_+^{2s-2}\tau_-^2 \lesssim \tau_-^{2s}$:

$$(4.47) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| (K_0)^\beta F_{\beta\gamma} \Im(\phi \overline{D^\gamma \phi}) \right| \cdot \tilde{w}_{s,\gamma,\epsilon} &\lesssim \tau_+^{2s+1} \left(|\alpha| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot |\mathcal{D}\phi| + |\rho| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right| \right) \cdot w_\gamma, \\ &+ \tau_+ \tau_-^{2s} \left(|\underline{\alpha}| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot |\mathcal{D}\phi| + |\rho| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot |D_{\underline{L}}\phi| \right) \cdot w_\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

To compute the second two terms on the right hand side of (4.41), first notice that a simple calculation similar to that used in lines (3.28)–(3.29) above, which we will omit, shows that:

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2} L(\tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon}) &\geq C_{\gamma,\epsilon}^{-1} \tau_+^{2s-2} \tau_0^{1+2\epsilon} w'_{\gamma,\epsilon}, \\ -\frac{1}{2} \underline{L}(\tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon}) &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that we only care that the second term above is non-negative as this will be its only use in our proof of (4.19). In particular, the above two lines allow us to conclude that:

$$(4.48) \quad -\frac{1}{2(u\underline{u})^2} {}^H \tilde{Q}_{L\beta}[\phi](K_0)^\beta \cdot L(\tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon}) \geq C_{\gamma,\epsilon}^{-1} \tau_+^{2s-2} \tau_0^{1+2\epsilon} \left(u^2 \left| \frac{1}{u\underline{u}} D_{\underline{L}}(u\underline{u}\phi) \right|^2 + \underline{u}^2 |\mathcal{D}\phi|^2 \right) \cdot w'_{\gamma,\epsilon},$$

$$(4.49) \quad -\frac{1}{2(u\underline{u})^2} {}^H \tilde{Q}_{L\beta}[\phi](K_0)^\beta \cdot \underline{L}(\tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon}) \geq 0.$$

Combining the estimates (4.43)–(4.49) into the identity (4.42) and excluding all the terms on the right hand side of the resulting inequality except those which involve the $D_{\underline{L}}$ derivative and the characteristic term involving the D_L derivative, we arrive at our complement to estimate (4.36):

$$(4.50) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} r^{2(s+\gamma)} \left| \frac{1}{r^2} D(r^2 \phi) \right|^2 dx \\ &+ \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |G| \cdot \left(\tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right| + \tau_-^{2s} |D_{\underline{L}}\phi| + \tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{u\phi}{\underline{u}r} \right| \right) \cdot w_\gamma dx dt \\ &+ \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tau_+^{2s+1} \left(|\alpha| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot |\mathcal{D}\phi| + |\rho| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right| \right) \cdot w_\gamma dx dt \\ &+ \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tau_+ \tau_-^{2s} \left(|\underline{\alpha}| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot |\mathcal{D}\phi| + |\rho| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot |D_{\underline{L}}\phi| \right) \cdot w_\gamma dx dt \\ &\geq C_{\gamma,\epsilon}^{-1} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} \int_{\{t\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} \tau_+^{2s-2} u^2 \left| \frac{1}{u\underline{u}} D_{\underline{L}}(u\underline{u}\phi) \right|^2 w_\gamma dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sup_u \int_{C(u) \cap \{0 \leq t \leq t_0\}} \tau_+^{2s-2} \underline{u}^2 \left| \frac{1}{u\underline{u}} D_L(u\underline{u}\phi) \right|^2 w_\gamma dV_{C(u)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tau_+^{2s-2} \tau_0^{1+2\epsilon} u^2 \left| \frac{1}{u\underline{u}} D_{\underline{L}}(u\underline{u}\phi) \right|^2 w'_{\gamma,\epsilon} dx dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We now form estimate (4.19) by adding together estimates (4.36), (4.38), and (4.50),

while also using some further identities to simplify the resulting right and left hand sides. First, notice that by again using the expressions (4.16)–(4.17) we can estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_-^{2s} |D_{\underline{L}}\phi|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right|^2 &\lesssim \tau_+^{2s-2} \underline{u}^2 \left| \frac{1}{\underline{u}\underline{u}} D_{\underline{L}}(u\underline{u}\phi) \right|^2 + |D_{\underline{L}}\phi|^2 + \tau_-^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_{\underline{L}}(r\phi) \right|^2, \\ \tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{u\phi}{\underline{u}r} \right|^2 &\lesssim \tau_+^{2s-2} \underline{u}^2 \left| \frac{1}{\underline{u}\underline{u}} D_L(u\underline{u}\phi) \right|^2 + |D_L\phi|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using the bound:

$$\tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{u\phi}{\underline{u}r} \right|^2 \lesssim \tau_-^{2s} \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right|^2,$$

and the energy notation (4.18), and expanding out the $t = 0$ energy expressions on the left hand side of the resulting estimate we conclude that:

$$\begin{aligned} E_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] &\leq C_{\gamma,\epsilon} \left[\int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |G| \cdot \left(\tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right| + \tau_-^{2s} |D_{\underline{L}}\phi| + \tau_-^{2s} \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \right) \cdot w_\gamma \, dxdt \right. \\ &\quad \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tau_+^{2s+1} \left(|\alpha| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot |\not{D}\phi| + |\rho| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right| \right) \cdot w_\gamma \, dxdt \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tau_+ \tau_-^{2s} \left(|\underline{\alpha}| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot |\not{D}\phi| + |\rho| \cdot \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \cdot |D_{\underline{L}}\phi| \right) \cdot w_\gamma \, dxdt \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma} \left(|D\phi|^2 + \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right|^2 \right) dx \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Setting:

$$|||G|||_{L^2[0,t_0](L^2)(s,\gamma)}^2 = \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tau_+^{2s} \tau_- |G|^2 w_{\gamma,\epsilon} \, dxdt,$$

and using the notation (4.20), the condition that $\epsilon \leq s - \frac{1}{2}$, and again using the bound $w_\gamma^2 \leq w_{\gamma,\epsilon} \tau_- w'_{\gamma,\epsilon}$ along with several different instances of the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality we have:

$$\begin{aligned} E_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] &\leq C_{\gamma,\epsilon} \left[|||G|||_{L^2[0,t_0](L^2)(s,\gamma)} \cdot (E_0^{\frac{1}{2}})^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] + |||F|||_{L^\infty[0,t_0](\epsilon)} \cdot E_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma} \left(|D\phi|^2 + \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right|^2 \right) dx \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing this last expression through by $(E^{\frac{1}{2}})^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi]$ and squaring, we easily achieve the bound:

$$\begin{aligned} E^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] &\leq C_{\gamma,\epsilon}^2 \left[|||G|||_{L^2[0,t_0](L^2)(s,\gamma)}^2 + |||F|||_{L^\infty[0,t_0](\epsilon)}^2 \cdot E^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma} \left(|D\phi|^2 + \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right|^2 \right) dx \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The estimate (4.19) now follows from this last line and the following gauge covariant Poincare type estimate which follows from the same reasoning used to produce (6.7)

which we shall prove in the sequel:

$$\int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma} \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right|^2 dx \lesssim \int_{\{t=0\} \cap \mathbb{R}^3} (1+r^2)^{s+\gamma} |D\phi|^2 dx .$$

□

5. L^∞ ESTIMATES FOR ELECTRO-MAGNETIC FIELDS

This section is the sequel to Section 3 above in that it contains the second main set of estimates for the field strength $F_{\alpha\beta}$. Here we will prove L^∞ type estimates for this quantity without assuming that it necessarily satisfies the field equations (1.17). That is, in this section we will only assume that $F_{\alpha\beta}$ is an arbitrary two-form and will prove L^∞ type estimates for it at the cost of bounds on the energies (3.46). This is done through the well known procedure of applying global Sobolev inequalities in conjunction with geometric identity (2.1b) for the component decomposition of the Lie derivative of a two-form. This procedure was first explored in [3], and our treatment adds little except a bound on the $L^2(L^\infty)$ term in the norm (4.21). This turns out to be a direct consequence of the space-time L^2 estimate (3.48) and the weighted Sobolev estimates (10.14)–(10.15) and (10.19). However, we choose to prove the entire L^∞ estimate from scratch here primarily for the sake of completeness and because we use the fractional weights τ_+^{2s}, τ_-^{2s} .

Before we proceed with the main estimate of this section, we introduce two notational devices which will allow us to reduce things to a more simple form where the estimates (10.14)–(10.15) and (10.19) can be used directly. The first of these is a simple algebraic tool which will make dealing with various commutators more straight forward. This is the introduction of the “radial boost” field:

$$(5.1) \quad \Omega_{0r} = \omega^i \Omega_{0i} = -\frac{1}{2} (\underline{u}L - u\underline{L}) .$$

It has the advantage of commuting with the rotation and scaling fields $\{\Omega_{ij}, S\}$. Furthermore, it turns out that Ω_{0r} preserves the null decomposition (2.23) even after one reexpands Ω_{0r} and passes back to the usual boosts Ω_{i0} . This remarkable fact¹⁰ as well as the rule that we only need one instance of the boosts in the exterior according to (10.14) will help to streamline the steps we take in the sequel.

The second tool we use here is a dyadic decomposition of the distance to the standard light-cone $u = 0$, as well as the distance along its translates $u = \text{const.}$ We will use this tool to localize all of our L^∞ estimates to shells adapted to these distances. This allows us to add extra powers of τ_+, τ_- at will because they just appear as constants in our localized estimates. The language for this is as follows:

We first isolate on each fixed time slice $t = \text{const.}$ the extended exterior region $t < 2r$. We then chop this into dyadic pieces depending on the distance from the

¹⁰It is not a-priori clear that this should happen given the fact that the boosts Ω_{i0} cause quite a bit of permutation in the null decomposition (2.23).

cone $u = 0$. We decompose the extended exterior region into the set of double spherical shells:

$$\mathcal{J}_i = \{x \in \{t\} \times \mathbb{R}^3, t < 2r \mid 2^i \leq |t - |x|| + 1 \leq 2^{i+1}\}, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

For fixed $0 < i$, each of these sets can be further decomposed into exterior and interior portions $\mathcal{J}_i = \mathcal{J}_i^+ \cup \mathcal{J}_i^-$, where $\mathcal{J}_i^\pm$ contains only the points where $0 < \mp u$. Note that these sets are connected, and that $\mathcal{J}_i^-$ empty for i sufficiently large. In general, we will write $\mathcal{J}$ for one of these connected sets. We also form a partition of unity adapted to the decomposition $\mathcal{J}_i$ which has the homogeneity property:

$$|\partial_r \chi_{\mathcal{J}_i}| \lesssim \tau_-^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_i),$$

where:

$$(5.2) \quad \tau_+(\mathcal{J}_i) = \min_{x \in \mathcal{J}_i} \tau_+, \quad \tau_-(\mathcal{J}_i) = \min_{x \in \mathcal{J}_i} \tau_-.$$

Furthermore, we note that it is clear that we can also choose the largest $\mathcal{J}_i^-$ so its cutoff is supported where $r \leq \frac{1}{4}t$. When the context is understood, we will simply substitute χ for $\chi_{\mathcal{J}_i}$ and τ_+, τ_- for $\tau_+(\mathcal{J}), \tau_-(\mathcal{J})$.

Next, we deal with the light-cones $u = \text{const}$. The notation we use here is similar to what was outlined in the preceding paragraph, and we will only consider the portion of $C(u)$ in the region where $t < 2r$. For each such cone (omitting the dependence on u), we define the dyadic conical spherical shells:

$$\mathcal{I}_i = \{x \in C(u), 0 \leq t < 2r \mid 2^i \leq t + |x| + 1 \leq 2^{i+1}\}, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We use the notation $\tau_+(\mathcal{I}_i), \tau_-(\mathcal{I}_i)$ in analogy with line (5.2) above. We also introduce a smooth partition of unity $\chi_{\mathcal{I}_i}$ adapted to the $\mathcal{I}_i$ which satisfies the bounds:

$$|L(\chi_{\mathcal{I}_i})| \lesssim \tau_+^{-1}(\mathcal{I}_i).$$

In particular, notice that we have not cut off strictly along the truncated cone $C(u) \cap \{0 \leq t \leq t_0\}$, but we may assume that each of these χ are supported where $t < 4r$.

Using these notations we now glue together the estimates (10.14)–(10.15), (10.19), and (10.20)–(10.21) of the Appendix into a form which will be used in the sequel:

Lemma 5.1 (Weighted global Sobolev estimates). *Let f be a test function on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3$, and let w_γ be the weight function defined on line (3.15). Then on each time slice $t = \text{const}$. with $1 \leq t$ one has the following (non-uniform) estimates for arbitrary weights $\delta_\pm \in \mathbb{R}$:*

$$(5.3) \quad \sup_{t \leq 2r} |\tau_+^{1+\delta_+} \tau_-^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta_-} f|^2 w_\gamma \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{\partial_r, S, \Omega_{0r}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} \|\tau_+^{\delta_+} \tau_-^{\delta_-} w_\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} X^I Y^J(f)\|_{L_x^2(t < 4r)}^2,$$

$$(5.4) \quad \sup_{2r < t} |\tau_+^{\frac{3}{2}+\delta_+} f|^2 \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{S, \Omega_{0i}\}}} \|\tau_+^{\delta_+} X^I(f)\|_{L_x^2(r < \frac{3}{4}t)}^2,$$

Furthermore, defining the truncated cones:

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{C}(u) &= C(u) \cap \{1 \leq t \leq t_0\} \cap \{t < 2r\} , \\ \tilde{C}(u) &= C(u) \cap \{1 \leq t \leq t_0\} \cap \{t < 4r\} ,\end{aligned}$$

we have the characteristic L^∞ estimate:

$$(5.5) \quad \sup_{(t,x) \in \overline{C}(u)} |\tau_+^{\frac{3}{2}+\delta_+} f|^2 \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{\Omega_{0r}, S\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} \|\tau_+^{\delta_+} X^I Y^J(f)\|_{L_x^2(\tilde{C}(u))}^2 .$$

In the above estimates, $\mathbb{O} = \{\Omega_{ij}\}$ denotes the Lie algebra of the rotation group.

Proof of (5.3)–(5.5). These follow almost directly from their local versions (10.14)–(10.15), (10.19), and (10.20)–(10.21). We'll just deal with (5.3) here as the other two estimates follow from similar reasoning and are left to the reader. For a dyadic shell J , by combining estimates (10.14)–(10.15) in tandem (for example with the L^q set to $q = 3$) and using the estimate:

$$|\tau_- \partial_r \chi f| \lesssim |\tilde{\chi} f| + |\tilde{\chi} S(f)| + |\tilde{\chi} \Omega_{0r}(f)| + |\tilde{\chi} \partial_r f| ,$$

where $\tilde{\chi}$ is a cutoff on $\text{supp}\{\chi\}$, we arrive at:

$$\sup_x \tau_+^2 \tau_- |\chi f|^2 \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{\partial_r, S, \Omega_{0r}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} \|\tilde{\chi} X^I Y^J(f)\|_{L_x^2}^2 .$$

Since both sides of this last estimate are restricted to a doubling of the shell $\mathcal{J}$, we can multiply both sides by the constant $\tau_+^{2\delta_+}(\mathcal{J})\tau_-^{2\delta_-+2\gamma}(\mathcal{J})$ if $t < r$, and by the constant $\tau_+^{2\delta_+}(\mathcal{J})\tau_-^{2\delta_-}(\mathcal{J})$ if $r < t$. Doing this and then summing the result over all shells $\mathcal{J}$ in the extended exterior $t \leq 2r$ yields the desired result. $\square$

We now state and prove the main result of this section:

Proposition 5.2 (General L^∞ estimate for electro-magnetic fields). *Let $F_{\alpha\beta}$ be an arbitrary two-form on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3$, and let w_γ be the weight function defined on line (3.15). Then in terms of null decomposition (2.23) and the general energy norm (3.46), one has the following L^∞ estimate:*

$$(5.6) \quad \sup_{\substack{0 \leq t \leq t_0 \\ x \in \{t\} \times \mathbb{R}^3}} (\tau_+^{2s+3} |\alpha|^2 + \tau_+^2 \tau_-^{2s+1} |\underline{\alpha}|^2 + \tau_+^{2s+2} \tau_- (\rho^2 + \sigma^2)) \cdot w_\gamma \\ + \|\tau_+^{s+1} \tau_-^{\frac{1}{2}} (w')^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\gamma, \epsilon} \alpha\|_{L_t^2(L_x^\infty)[0, t_0]}^2 \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 2 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} E^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, t_0) [\mathcal{L}_X^I F] .$$

In particular, using the charge modified energy norm (3.47), and the general weighted L^∞ norm (4.21) we have that:

$$(5.7) \quad ||| F |||_{L^\infty[0, t_0](s, \gamma, \epsilon)} \lesssim E_2^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, t_0) [F] .$$

Proof of estimate (5.6). In what follows, we shall only consider the estimate (5.6) in the region $1 \leq t$. For $0 \leq t \leq 1$ the result follows from a weighted estimate on the electric-magnetic decomposition (1.9) in conjunction with a simple weighted version of the usual Sobolev embedding. We leave the details of this to the reader.

The proof can now be broken down into three sections. All of the components in the first term on the left hand side of (5.6) except α can be treated with fixed time energy estimates. The pure L^∞ estimate for α is a consequence of characteristic energies, while the mixed norm estimate follows from the space-time energy estimate contained in (3.48).

Bounds on $\{\underline{\alpha}, \rho, \sigma\}$. We first prove this assertion for the $\underline{\alpha}$ component in both the extended exterior region $t < 2r$ and its complement $r < \frac{1}{2}t$. In fact, it is just as easy to demonstrate the full bound:

$$(5.8) \quad \sup_x \tau_+^2 \tau_-^{2s+1} (|E|^2 + |H|^2) \cdot w_\gamma \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{\partial_r, S, \Omega_{0r}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} \|\tau_-^s w_\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} (E(\mathcal{L}_X^I \mathcal{L}_Y^J F), H(\mathcal{L}_X^I \mathcal{L}_Y^J F))\|_{L_x^2}^2.$$

To prove (5.8), we first combine estimates (5.3) and (5.4) with $\delta^+ = 0, \delta^- = s$ and $\delta^+ = s$ respectively. This yields the following bound for scalar components:

$$\sup_x \tau_+^2 \tau_-^{2s+1} (|E|^2 + |H|^2) \cdot w_\gamma \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{\partial_r, S, \Omega_{0r}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} \|\tau_-^s w_\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} (X^I Y^J(E), X^I Y^J(H))\|_{L_x^2}^2.$$

To finish things up, we need only show the following point-wise bounds:

$$\sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{\partial_r, S, \Omega_{0r}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} |(X^I Y^J(E), X^I Y^J(H))|^2 \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{\partial_i, S, \Omega_{0i}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} |(E(\mathcal{L}_X^I \mathcal{L}_Y^J F), H(\mathcal{L}_X^I \mathcal{L}_Y^J F))|^2.$$

This, in turn, follows immediately from expanding out the vector-fields ∂_r and Ω_{0r} in terms of elements of $\mathbb{L}$, and then using the Lie derivative formula (2.1b) in conjunction with the commutator identity (2.31a). The important thing to note here is that in this latter formula one always ends up with constant linear combinations of elements of the translation invariant frame $\{\partial_\alpha\}$. This allows one to write the bracket terms on the right hand side of (2.1b) directly in terms of constant coefficient linear combinations of (E, H) .

Our next step is to bound the terms ρ and σ in the extended exterior $t < 2r$. This, combined with estimate (5.8) above in the deep interior $r < \frac{1}{2}t$, will demonstrate

(5.6) for these components. We now need to be a bit more careful regarding how the operation of Lie differentiation permutes null components. To take this into account, we will again make use of (2.1b) as well as the expansion identities (2.33) for Lie derivatives, with some additional help from the frame identities on line (2.21). First, notice that to expand vector-fields of the form $X_r = \omega^i X_i$, the formula (2.1b) implies:

$$(5.9) \quad (\mathcal{L}_{X_r} F_{\alpha\beta}) = \omega^i (\mathcal{L}_{X_i} F)_{\alpha\beta} + e_\alpha(\omega^i) X_i^\gamma F_{\gamma\beta} + e_\beta(\omega^i) X_i^\gamma F_{\alpha\gamma} .$$

Therefore, after some simple computations using the first of the special identities (the second will be used in a moment):

$$(5.10) \quad e_A(\omega^i) \omega_i = 0 , \quad e_A(\omega^i) \omega_i^B = \frac{1}{r} \delta_A^B ,$$

we arrive at the following equalities:

$$(5.11a) \quad \partial_r(\rho) = \omega^i \rho(\mathcal{L}_{\partial_i} F) , \quad \Omega_{ij}(\rho) = \rho(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega_{ij}} F) ,$$

$$(5.11b) \quad S(\rho) = \rho(\mathcal{L}_S F) - 2\rho , \quad \Omega_{0r}(\rho) = \omega^i \rho(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega_{0i}} F) .$$

and:

$$(5.12a) \quad \partial_r(\sigma) = \omega^i \sigma(\mathcal{L}_{\partial_i} F) , \quad \Omega_{ij}(\sigma) = \sigma(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega_{ij}} F) ,$$

$$(5.12b) \quad S(\sigma) = \rho(\mathcal{L}_S F) - 2\sigma , \quad \Omega_{0r}(\sigma) = \omega^i \sigma(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega_{0i}} F) .$$

Notice that the set (5.11) is easily proved using the identities (2.1b), (5.9), (2.21), and (2.33), while the second set (5.12) follows from (5.11) and the duality formulas (2.5) and (2.24).

Next, we see that by differentiating both sides of the expressions (5.11)–(5.12) with respect to the rotations Ω_{ij} and making use of the homogeneity bound:

$$(5.13) \quad |\Omega_{ij}(\omega_k)| \lesssim 1 ,$$

we arrive at the point-wise bound:

$$(5.14) \quad \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{\partial_r, S, \Omega_{0r}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} |X^I Y^J(\rho, \sigma)|^2 \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{\partial_i, S, \Omega_{0i}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} \rho^2(\mathcal{L}_X^I \mathcal{L}_Y^J F) + \sigma^2(\mathcal{L}_X^I \mathcal{L}_Y^J F) .$$

This last estimate, combined with the scalar L^∞ estimate:

$$(5.15) \quad \sup_{t < 2r} \tau_+^{2s+2} \tau_- w_\gamma(\rho^2 + \sigma^2) \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{\partial_r, S, \Omega_{0r}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} \|\tau_+^s w_\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} X^I Y^J(\rho, \sigma)\|_{L_x^2(t \leq 4r)}^2 ,$$

which follows from the bound (5.3) with $\delta_+ = s$ and $\delta_- = 0$, implies the estimate (5.6) for the components ρ and σ in the exterior region $t < 2r$. We have now completed the proof of (5.6) for the components $\underline{\alpha}$, ρ , and σ .

The $L^2(L^\infty)$ estimate for α . We now prove the mixed norm estimate:

$$(5.16) \quad \|\tau_+^{s+1}\tau_-^{\frac{1}{2}}(w')_{\gamma,\epsilon}^\frac{1}{2}\alpha\|_{L^2(L^\infty)}^2 \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I|\leq 2 \\ X\in\mathbb{L}}} E^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,t_0)[\mathcal{L}_X^I F] .$$

Due to the space-time energy estimate for α contained in the right hand side of (5.16), it suffices to prove the two fixed time estimates:

$$(5.17) \quad \sup_{t<2r} \tau_+^{2s+2}\tau_-|\alpha|^2 w'_{\gamma,\epsilon} \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I|\leq 1, |J|\leq 2 \\ |I|+|J|\leq 2 \\ X\in\{\partial_i, S, \Omega_{0i}\}, Y\in\mathbb{O}}} \|\tau_+^s(w')_{\gamma,\epsilon}^\frac{1}{2}\alpha(\mathcal{L}_X^I \mathcal{L}_Y^J F)\|_{L^2(t<4r)}^2 ,$$

$$(5.18) \quad \sup_{r<\frac{1}{2}t} \tau_+^{2s+2-2\epsilon}|\alpha|^2 \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I|\leq 2 \\ X\in\{S, \Omega_{0i}\}}} \|\tau_+^{s-1-\epsilon}\left(E(\mathcal{L}_X^I F), H(\mathcal{L}_X^I F)\right)\|_{L^2(r<\frac{3}{4}t)}^2 .$$

These in turn follow from the scalar estimates¹¹ (5.3)–(5.4) and the same procedure used above to prove the bounds (5.8) and (5.15) above. Specifically, notice that by the same types of calculations used to produce (5.11)–(5.11), in particular (2.1b), (2.33), (5.9), and the identities (5.10), we have that:

$$(5.19a) \quad \partial_r(\alpha_A) = \omega^i \alpha_A(\mathcal{L}_{\partial_i} F) ,$$

$$(5.19b) \quad \Omega_{ij}(\alpha_A) = \alpha_A(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega_{ij}} F) + [\Omega_{ij}, e_A]^B \alpha_B ,$$

$$(5.19c) \quad S(\alpha_A) = \alpha_A(\mathcal{L}_S F) - 2\alpha_A ,$$

$$(5.19d) \quad \Omega_{0r}(\alpha_A) = \omega^i \alpha_A(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega_{0i}} F) + \alpha_A .$$

These allow us to pass from a scalar estimate of the form (5.3) (with $\delta^+ = s$ and $\delta^- = 0$) in (5.17) to the right hand side of this estimate which contains Lie derivatives. To do this we simply differentiate both sides of the expressions (5.19) with respect to rotations, and then express the resulting right hand side in terms of the collection $\{\alpha, \alpha(\mathcal{L}_X F), \alpha(\mathcal{L}_X \mathcal{L}_Y F)\}$ for $X \in \mathbb{L}$ and $Y \in \mathbb{O}$. In doing this, if the extra angular derivative lands on a α component on the right hand side of (5.19), we can use these formulas to re-expand the result using the above remarks to bound the resulting coefficients. If, on the other hand, the extra angular derivative lands on a coefficient on the right hand side of (5.19) we can bound things by using (5.13) and its companion estimate:

$$(5.20) \quad |\Omega_{jk}([\Omega_{lm}, e_A]^B)| \lesssim 1 ,$$

which easily follows from the homogeneity property (2.19) of the fields $\{e_A\}$, and the fact that $\Omega_{ij}^A = r\tilde{\Omega}_{ij}^A$ where $\tilde{\Omega}_{ij}^A$ is a function of the angular variable only.

The L^∞ bound for α . We need only consider the case $t < 2r$, as the desired estimate in the compliment was proved on line (5.8) above. That is, we only need to prove this bound along the cones $\overline{C}(u)$ which were introduced just before estimate

¹¹It is clear that one can replace w_γ in estimate (5.3) with $w'_{\gamma,\epsilon}$.

(5.5) above. Using that estimate with $\delta_+ = s$, we have the scalar bound:

$$\sup_{(t,x) \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}(u)} \tau_+^{2s+3} w_\gamma |\alpha|^2 \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{S, \Omega_{0r}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} \|\tau_+^s w_\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} X^I Y^J(\alpha)\|_{L_x^2(\bar{\mathcal{C}}(u))}^2.$$

Notice that the w_γ factor can be added in at will because it is a constant on the cones $C(u)$. Using this last line, we see that it suffices to prove the point-wise bound:

$$\sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{S, \Omega_{0r}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} |X^I Y^J(\alpha)|^2 \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{S, \Omega_{0i}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} |\alpha(\mathcal{L}_X^I \mathcal{L}_Y^J F)|^2.$$

This in turn follows from the decomposition formulas (5.19) and the coefficient bounds (5.13) and (5.20). The details are left to the reader. This completes our proof of estimate (5.6). $\square$

We end this section with a discussion of the peeling properties of Lie derivatives of the charge portion $\bar{F}$ of the curvature F . This will be used in the following sections wherever the quantities $\mathcal{L}_X^I \bar{F}_{\alpha\beta}$ occur because, while there are nice explicit formulas for these objects, they obey no useful space-time estimates.

Proposition 5.3 (Peeling properties of the pure charge fields $\bar{F}_{\alpha\beta}$). *Let $F_{\alpha\beta}$ be an electro-magnetic field, and let $\bar{F}_{\alpha\beta}$ be its pure charge component as defined on the line (3.10). Then for each multiindex I we have the following L^∞ estimates:*

$$(5.21) \quad |\alpha(\mathcal{L}_X^I \bar{F})| \leq C_I |q(F)| \cdot \tau_0 \tau_+^{-2} \chi_{t < r+1},$$

$$(5.22) \quad |\underline{\alpha}(\mathcal{L}_X^I \bar{F})|, |\rho(\mathcal{L}_X^I \bar{F})|, |\sigma(\mathcal{L}_X^I \bar{F})| \leq C_I |q(F)| \cdot \tau_+^{-2} \chi_{t < r+1},$$

where all $X \in \mathbb{L}$.

Proof of the estimates (5.21)–(5.22). The proof is a simple inductive procedure similar to what was done for $\bar{J}_\alpha$ in section 3 starting on line (3.51). We begin by making the inductive hypothesis that:

$$(5.23) \quad \alpha(\mathcal{L}_X^I \bar{F}) = q \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{|I|} \frac{\Omega_\alpha^I(\omega)}{r^{2+k}} \cdot (\chi_k^+)_\alpha^I(r-t-2),$$

$$(5.24) \quad \underline{\alpha}(\mathcal{L}_X^I \bar{F}) = q \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{|I|} \frac{\Omega_\alpha^I(\omega)}{r^{2+k}} \cdot (\chi_k^+)_\alpha^I(r-t-2),$$

$$(5.25) \quad \rho(\mathcal{L}_X^I \bar{F}) = q \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{|I|} \frac{\Omega_\rho^I(\omega)}{r^{2+k}} \cdot (\chi_k^+)_\rho^I(r-t-2),$$

$$(5.26) \quad \sigma(\mathcal{L}_X^I \bar{F}) = q \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{|I|} \frac{\Omega_\sigma^I(\omega)}{r^{2+k}} \cdot (\chi_k^+)_\sigma^I(r-t-2),$$

where the $\Omega_\bullet^I$ are smooth functions of the angular variable whose C^∞ bounds depend only on I and the specific component being considered, and the $(\chi_k^+)_\bullet^I(s)$ are

smooth functions of the single variable s which vanish for $s \leq -1$ and satisfy the homogeneity bound:

$$|\partial_s^j (\chi_k^+)^\bullet|^I \leq C_I s^{k-j} ,$$

for $1 \leq s$. Here, as in previous discussions, the product notation $\Omega \cdot \chi^+$ is symbolic for a sum of products of functions with these properties.

Now, from the formulas (3.10), it is clear that the assumption (5.23)–(5.26) holds for $|I| = 0$. Furthermore, simple explicit calculations using the formulas (2.32), and which we leave to the reader, show that differentiating as scalars the quantities on the right hand side of the formulas (5.23)–(5.26) yields quantities with these same properties. This follows simply from expressing everything in the derivative in terms of the variables u, r, ω . Therefore, it remains to show that one can inductively reproduce identities of this form after the bracket terms on the right hand side of formula (2.1b) are taken into account.

First notice that if the Lie derivative is with respect to the fields $\{\Omega_{ij}, S\}$ then the null decomposition (2.23) is preserved, so the claim follows from the fact that the coefficients in the expansions (2.33) can all be put in the form $\Omega(\omega) \cdot \varphi(\frac{u}{r})$ for some affine function φ .

Next, notice that while the translation invariant fields $\{\partial_\alpha\}$ do not preserve the decomposition (2.23), their coefficients in the formulas (2.33) introduce a factor which is bounded by $\frac{1}{r}$. Therefore, it remains to deal with the bracket portion when dealing boosts $\{\Omega_{0i}\}$. Notice that it suffices to limit discussion to the component α because the remaining components have the same general form in (5.24)–(5.26) above and the homogeneity of the coefficients in the formulas (2.33) guarantee that this general form is preserved after multiplication by them. The claim now follows from the explicit formulas (2.33f) and (2.33h), because the only thing that can disturb the structure of (5.23) is when one of the other components $\underline{\alpha}(\mathcal{L}_X^I \bar{F}), \rho(\mathcal{L}_X^I \bar{F})$ or $\sigma(\mathcal{L}_X^I \bar{F})$ gets moved to the α position. Notice that this in turn can only happen when an extra factor of $\frac{u}{r}$ is introduced, having the effect of causing the sum in formulas (5.24)–(5.26) to start with $k = 1$. This completes the demonstration of (5.21)–(5.22). $\square$

6. L^∞ ESTIMATE FOR COMPLEX SCALAR FIELDS

This section is the companion to Section 4. It contains L^∞ type estimates comparable to (5.6) for complex scalar fields in terms of bounds on energy norms of the kind (4.18). These will be proved as in the last section through the application of global Sobolev estimates and several geometric identities which reduce bounds on scalar derivatives to bounds on covariant derivatives. The device which ultimately enables us to do this the following simple, although far reaching, estimate of Kato:

Lemma 6.1 (Kato’s “diamagnetic” inequality). *Let ϕ be a section of V over $\mathcal{M}$, and denote by $|\phi|^2 = \langle \phi, \phi \rangle_V$. Then one has the point-wise inequality:*

$$(6.1) \quad |X(|\phi|)| \leq |D_X \phi| ,$$

for any vector-field X on $\mathcal{M}$.

Proof of (6.1). This is a straight forward consequence of the compatibility condition (1.1). We compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
X(|\phi|) &= X\left(\langle\phi, \phi\rangle_V^{\frac{1}{2}}\right), \\
&= \frac{X\langle\phi, \phi\rangle_V}{2\langle\phi, \phi\rangle_V^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \\
&= \frac{\langle D_X \phi, \phi\rangle_V + \langle\phi, D_X \phi\rangle_V}{2|\phi|}, \\
&= \Re\left(\left\langle \frac{\phi}{|\phi|}, D_X \phi \right\rangle_V\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying absolute values to both sides of the above equation and using the Cauchy–Schwartz inequality, the desired result follows. $\square$

As a first application of estimate (6.1), we prove the following generalization of estimates (5.3)–(5.5) to complex scalar fields:

Lemma 6.2 (Weighted global Sobolev estimates for complex scalar fields). *Let and let ϕ be a section of V over $\mathcal{M}$, and let w_γ be the weight function defined on line (3.15). Then on each time slice $t = \text{const.}$, with $1 \leq t$, one has the estimates:*

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.2) \quad \sup_{t \leq 2r} |\tau_+^{1+\delta_+} \tau_-^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta_-} \phi|^2 w_\gamma &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{\partial_r, S, \Omega_{0r}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} \|\tau_+^{\delta_+} \tau_-^{\delta_-} w_\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} D_X^I D_Y^J \phi\|_{L_x^2(t < 4r)}^2, \\
(6.3) \quad \sup_{2r < t} |\tau_+^{\frac{3}{2}+\delta_+} \phi|^2 &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{S, \Omega_{0i}\}}} \|\tau_+^{\delta_+} D_X^I \phi\|_{L_x^2(r < \frac{3}{4}t)}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, defining the truncated cones:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{C}(u) &= C(u) \cap \{1 \leq t \leq t_0\} \cap \{t < 2r\}, \\
\tilde{C}(u) &= C(u) \cap \{1 \leq t \leq t_0\} \cap \{t < 4r\},
\end{aligned}$$

we have the characteristic L^∞ estimate:

$$(6.4) \quad \sup_{(t,x) \in \tilde{C}(u)} |\tau_+^{\frac{3}{2}+\delta_+} \phi|^2 \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{S - \Omega_{0r}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} \|\tau_+^{\delta_+} D_X^I D_Y^J \phi\|_{L_x^2(\tilde{C}(u))}^2.$$

In the above estimates, $\mathbb{O} = \{\Omega_{ij}\}$ denotes the Lie algebra of the rotation group.

Remark 6.3. Notice that we have used the vector-field $S - \Omega_{0r}$ instead of the individuals $\{S, \Omega_{0r}\}$ in the statement of estimate (6.4) above. This additional structure will be important in the sequel.

Proof of estimates (6.2)–(6.4). The proof of these are virtually identical to the proof of (5.3)–(5.5), with the added twist that one uses (6.1) after each application of the scalar estimates (10.14)–(10.15), (10.19), and (10.20)–(10.21) to expand the scalar derivatives to covariant derivatives. The details are left to the interested reader. $\square$

It will also be useful for us to have a version of the estimate (6.2) which is tailored to deal with the initial data (1.18b) in the context of the norms which appear on the left hand side of (1.25).

Lemma 6.4 (Weighted Sobolev estimates for the initial data). *Let ϕ be a section of the hyperplane bundle $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{C}$ and let $\frac{1}{2} < s_0$ be a given parameter. Then the following weighted L^∞ estimates hold assuming that their right hand side is finite:*

$$(6.5) \quad \sup_x (1+r)^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}} |\phi| \lesssim \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |I| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{\partial_i\}}} \|(1+r)^{s_0-1+|I|} D_X^I \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} ,$$

$$(6.6) \quad \sup_x (1+r)^{s_0+\frac{3}{2}} |\phi| \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{\partial_i\}}} \|(1+r)^{s_0+|I|} D_X^I \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} .$$

Proof of the estimates (6.5)–(6.6). The proof of these is almost identical to the proof of estimate (6.4) above. We simply apply the estimate (10.14)–(10.15) of the appendix in order to the functions $\chi\phi$, χ now being the cutoff on a spherical shell of dyadic distance from the origin, using the Kato inequality (6.1) after each step. Then, using the differential bounds:

$$|\partial_i^I \chi| \lesssim (1+r)^{-|I|} \tilde{\chi} ,$$

where $\tilde{\chi}$ is some cutoff on the support of χ , and adding together over all the (finitely overlapping) χ we arrive at the set of estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_x (1+r)^{s_0+\frac{1}{2}} |\phi| &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{\partial_i\}}} \|(1+r)^{s_0-1+|I|} D_X^I \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} , \\ \sup_x (1+r)^{s_0+\frac{3}{2}} |\phi| &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{\partial_i\}}} \|(1+r)^{s_0+|I|} D_X^I \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} . \end{aligned}$$

The second of the above estimates is already of the form (6.6). To conclude (6.5) from the first estimate above we simply need to eliminate the zero order derivative term. This can be done through the use of the following covariant Poincare type estimate which holds for $\frac{1}{2} < s_0$ assuming that ϕ is both smooth and compactly supported (which we may do via a standard density argument):

$$(6.7) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (1+r)^{2s_0-2} |\phi|^2 dx \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (1+r)^{2s_0} |D_r \phi|^2 dx .$$

By an application of the Kato estimate (6.1), this last estimate follows from the corresponding statement with ϕ replaced by a real valued (smooth and compactly supported) test function φ , and the covariant derivative D_r replaced by ∂_r . This

in turn is achieved by integrating both sides of the following identity with respect to the measure $dr d\omega$ and then applying a Cauchy-Schwartz:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_r \left((1+r)^{2s_0-1} r^2 \varphi^2 \right) &= (2s_0-1)(1+r)^{2s_0-2} r^2 \varphi^2 + \\ &\quad 2(1+r)^{2s_0-1} r \varphi^2 + 2(1+r)^{2s_0-1} r^2 \varphi \partial_r \varphi . \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (6.5)–(6.6). $\square$

Before proceeding to the main estimate of this section, we first prove another set of preliminary estimates which will be extremely useful in the sequel. These are conjugated versions of the estimate (6.7) above which also involve the optical weight τ_- , and which we also call Poincare estimates:

Lemma 6.5 (Covariant Poincare estimates for time slices). *Let ϕ be a section to V over $\mathcal{M}$ which has finite $H^{1, \frac{p+q}{2}}$ norm (see line (1.21)), and let D_r denote the corresponding radial covariant derivative. Then for constants p, q such that both $|q| < p+1$ and $-1 < p$ one has the following estimate:*

$$(6.8) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tau_-^p \tau_+^q |\phi|^2 dx \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tau_-^{p+2} \tau_+^q \left| \frac{1}{r} D_r(r\phi) \right|^2 dx ,$$

where the implicit constant depends on both p and q . More specifically, in the exterior region one has the estimate:

$$(6.9) \quad \int_{t < r} \tau_-^p \tau_+^q |\phi|^2 dx \lesssim \int_{t < r} \tau_-^{p+2} \tau_+^q \left| \frac{1}{r} D_r(r\phi) \right|^2 dx ,$$

whenever $0 < p+1+q$ and $-1 < p$, and in the interior one has:

$$(6.10) \quad \int_{r < t} \tau_-^p \tau_+^q |\phi|^2 dx \lesssim \int_{r < t} \tau_-^{p+2} \tau_+^q \left| \frac{1}{r} D_r(r\phi) \right|^2 dx ,$$

for values $q < p+1$ and $-1 < p$.

Proof of estimate (6.8). Keeping in mind the bound (6.1), it is clear that we only need to consider the incarnation of (6.8) with ϕ replaced by the real valued test function $\varphi = |\phi|$ and D_r replaced by the usual radial derivative ∂_r . Notice that φ is both bounded and has finite $H^{1, \frac{p+q}{2}}$ (non-covariant) norm. We now consider the regions $t < r$ and $r < t$ separately.

In the first case, it suffices to prove (6.8) with τ_- replaced by $1 - u$ and τ_+ replaced by $1 + \underline{u}$. Furthermore, since we are assuming that the left hand side of (6.9) is finite we will proceed via a density argument that assumes φ is both smooth and compactly supported. This is because in order get things to work below we need to use the truncated mollification:

$$(6.11) \quad \varphi_\epsilon = \chi_\epsilon \cdot f_\epsilon * \varphi ,$$

where $\chi_\epsilon = \chi(\epsilon^{-1} \cdot)$ for some $O(1)$ supported smooth unit function χ , and $f_\epsilon = \epsilon^{-3} f(\epsilon^{-1} \cdot)$ for some positive smooth function f with unit mass. Now, a standard argument shows this mollification is such that $\varphi_\epsilon \rightarrow \varphi$ in the space $H^{1, \frac{p+q}{2}}$. Therefore, we are reduced to showing that for each fixed value of ϵ we have the bound

(6.9) for φ_ϵ . In particular, we may assume from the start that φ is smooth and compact. With this in mind, we integrate the identity:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_r \left((1-u)^{p+1} (1+\underline{u})^q (r\varphi)^2 \right) &= (p+1)(1-u)^p (1+\underline{u})^q (r\varphi)^2 \\ &+ q(1-u)^{p+1} (1+\underline{u})^{q-1} (r\varphi)^2 + 2(1-u)^{p+1} (1+\underline{u})^q \partial_r(r\varphi)(r\varphi) . \end{aligned}$$

with respect to the measure $drd\omega$ over the region $t < r$ to achieve:

$$\begin{aligned} (6.12) \quad \int_{t < r} h^{p,q}(t,r) |\varphi|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{S}_{t=r}^2} (1+2r)^q |\varphi|^2 dV_{\mathbb{S}_{t=r}^2} \\ = 2 \int \int (1-u)^{p+1} (1+\underline{u})^q \partial_r(r\varphi)(r\varphi) drd\omega , \end{aligned}$$

where $h^{p,q}(t,r)$ is the weight function given by:

$$\begin{aligned} h^{p,q}(t,r) &= (p+1)(1-u)^p (1+\underline{u})^q + q(1-u)^{p+1} (1+\underline{u})^{q-1} , \\ &= (1-u)^p (1+\underline{u})^q \left((p+1) + q \frac{1-u}{1+\underline{u}} \right) . \end{aligned}$$

The conditions $-1 < p$ and $-q < p+1$ now easily guarantee the existence of a constant $C_{p,q}$ such that we have the point-wise bounds:

$$C_{p,q}^{-1} (1-u)^p (1+\underline{u})^q \leq h^{p,q}(t,r) \leq C_{p,q} (1-u)^p (1+\underline{u})^q .$$

Applying this last bound and a Cauchy–Schwartz to the square of (6.12) with the angular integral on the left hand side discarded, we arrive at the estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{t < r} (1-u)^p (1+\underline{u})^q |\varphi|^2 dx \right)^2 \\ \lesssim \int_{t < r} (1-u)^p (1+\underline{u})^q |\varphi|^2 dx \cdot \int_{t < r} (1-u)^{p+2} (1+\underline{u})^q \left| \frac{1}{r} \partial_r(r\varphi) \right|^2 dx . \end{aligned}$$

This proves the assertion (6.9) by moving back to the weights τ_+, τ_- .

We now prove the exterior estimate (6.10). We will again proceed via a density argument in which we assume φ is smooth¹² and hence bounded at the origin $r = 0$. The estimate follows essentially the same steps as above. First, we replace the weights τ_+, τ_- by $(1+u)$ and $(1+\underline{u})$ respectively. The analog of (6.12) now reads:

$$\begin{aligned} (6.13) \quad \int_{r < t} h^{p,q}(t,r) |\varphi|^2 dx - \int_{\mathbb{S}_{t=r}^2} (1+2r)^q |\varphi|^2 dV_{\mathbb{S}_{t=r}^2} \\ = 2 \int \int (1+u)^{p+1} (1+\underline{u})^q \partial_r(r\varphi)(r\varphi) drd\omega , \end{aligned}$$

where this time $h^{p,q}(t,r)$ is given by the expression:

$$h^{p,q}(t,r) = (1+u)^p (1+\underline{u})^q \left(-(p+1) + q \frac{1+u}{1+\underline{u}} \right) .$$

¹²The only thing one needs to check here is that $\|\chi_{\leq 1} \cdot r^{-1}(\varphi_\epsilon - \varphi)\|_{L^2} \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, but this follows from the vanilla Poincare estimate (4.15) which holds in the spaces $H^{1,k}$.

The bounds $-1 < p$ and $q < p + 1$ now imply the existence of a constant $C_{p,q}$ such that:

$$C_{p,q}^{-1}(1+u)^p(1+\underline{u})^q \leq -h^{p,q}(t,r) \leq C_{p,q}(1+u)^p(1+\underline{u})^q .$$

The remainder of the proof now proceeds by squaring and using Cauchy-Schwartz as above. $\square$

We are now ready to state and prove the main estimate of this section:

Proposition 6.6 (L^∞ estimates for complex scalar fields). *Let ϕ be a section to V over $\mathcal{M}$ with norm $|\cdot|^2$ and compatible connection D . Let $F_{\alpha\beta}$ be the curvature tensor of D . Define the k^{th} weighted generalized energy content of ϕ in the time slab $0 \leq t \leq t_0$ to be:*

$$(6.14) \quad E_k^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,t_0)[\phi] = \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} E_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,t_0)[D_X^I \phi] ,$$

where $E_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,t_0)[\phi]$ is defined on line (4.18). Now define the time-slab L^∞ type norm:

$$(6.15) \quad \begin{aligned} ||| \phi |||_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 &= \| \tau_+^{s+1} \tau_-^{\frac{1}{2}} (w')_{\gamma,\epsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \chi_{t < 2r} + D_L \phi \chi_{r < \frac{1}{2}t} \right) \|_{L^2(L^\infty)[0,t_0]}^2 \\ &\quad + \tau_+^{2s+3} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \chi_{t < 2r} + D_L \phi \chi_{r < \frac{1}{2}t} \right|^2 \cdot w_\gamma \\ &\quad \left(\tau_+^2 \tau_-^{2s-1} |\phi|^2 + \tau_+^2 \tau_-^{2s+1} |D_{\underline{L}} \phi|^2 + \tau_+^{2s+2} \tau_- (|\mathcal{P}\phi|^2 + \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \left| \frac{D_X^I \phi}{\tau_+} \right|^2) \right) \cdot w_\gamma . \end{aligned}$$

Then recalling the definition of the energy norm (3.47) for the curvature $F_{\alpha\beta}$, we have the following nonlinear estimate for the field ϕ under the additional assumption that $\epsilon < s - \frac{1}{2}$:

$$(6.16) \quad ||| \phi |||_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 \lesssim E_2^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,t_0)[\phi] \cdot \left(1 + E_2^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,t_0)[F] \right) + E_2^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,t_0)[F] \cdot ||| \phi |||_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 .$$

Proof of estimate (6.16). To begin with we may assume that $1 \leq t$, as the complementary case can easily be dealt with by a straightforward application of radially weighted Sobolev estimates and energy bounds similar to what we will use in the deep interior region $r < \frac{1}{2}t$. We now split cases according to whether $t < 2r$ or $r < \frac{1}{2}t$.

Estimate (6.15) for $D_{\underline{L}}\phi$ in the region $t < 2r$, and for all components in the region $r < \frac{1}{2}t$. As in the proof of Proposition 5.2 above, we will deal with the worst component estimate together with the deep interior estimate. These are both

a consequence of the single fixed time bound (where we leave the time dependence on the left hand side implicit):

$$(6.17) \quad \sup_x \tau_+^2 \tau_-^{2s+1} (|D\phi|^2 + \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} |\frac{D_X^I \phi}{\tau_+}|^2) \cdot w_\gamma \lesssim \\ E_2^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, t_0)[\phi] \cdot \left(1 + \|F\|_{L^\infty[0, t_0](s, \gamma, \epsilon)}^2\right) + E_1^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, t_0)[F] \cdot \|\phi\|_{L^\infty[0, t_0](s, \gamma, \epsilon)}^2.$$

To prove this estimate, we first make a preliminary reduction. Notice that by the homogeneity property of any $X \in \mathbb{L}$ we easily have the bound:

$$(6.18) \quad \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} |\frac{D_X^I \phi}{\tau_+}|^2 \lesssim |D\phi|^2 + |\frac{\phi}{\tau_+}|^2.$$

We will now prove the bound (6.17) for the right hand side of (6.18) above. We begin by using estimates (6.2) and (6.3) together with weights $\delta^+ = 0, \delta^- = s$ and $\delta^+ = s$ (respectively) for the first term on the right hand side of (6.18), and weights $\delta^+ = -1, \delta^- = s$ and $\delta^+ = s - 1$ (respectively) for the second term, which allows us to give the full bound:

$$(6.19) \quad \sup_x \tau_+^2 \tau_-^{2s+1} (|D\phi|^2 + |\frac{\phi}{\tau_+}|^2) \cdot w_\gamma \lesssim \\ \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 2 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_-^s w_\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} D_X^I D\phi\|_{L_x^2}^2 + \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 2 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_+^{-1} \tau_-^s w_\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} D_X^I \phi\|_{L_x^2}^2.$$

The second term on the right hand side of (6.19) is immediately bounded by R.H.S. (6.16), so we will concentrate on bounding the second. To do this we will need to deal with the commutator $[D_X^I, D]$. By using the formula (1.5) and the basic Lie algebra formulas (2.31), we arrive at the point-wise bound:

$$(6.20) \quad \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 2 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} |[D_X^I, D]\phi| \lesssim \tau_+ \cdot \sum_{\substack{|I|+|J| \leq 1 \\ X, Y \in \mathbb{L}}} |\mathcal{L}_X^I F| \cdot |D_Y^J \phi|.$$

Here we have used the notation $|\mathcal{L}_X^I F| = |E(\mathcal{L}_X^I F)| + |H(\mathcal{L}_X^I F)|$. Using the decomposition (3.12) and the L^∞ estimates (5.21)–(5.22), as well as the norm definitions (4.21) and (6.15) we can fold estimate (6.20) into (6.19) above and produce the bound:

$$\sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 2 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_-^s w_\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} D_X^I D\phi\|_{L_x^2}^2 \lesssim E_2^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}[\phi] \cdot \left(1 + \|F\|_{L^\infty[0, t_0](s, \gamma, \epsilon)}^2\right) \\ + E_1^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}[F] \cdot \|\phi\|_{L^\infty[0, t_0](s, \gamma, \epsilon)}^2 + \|F\|_{L^\infty[0, t_0](s, \gamma, \epsilon)}^2 \cdot \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_-^{-\frac{1}{2}} D_X^I \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2.$$

The first two terms on the right hand side of this last expression are exactly what we see on the right hand side of (6.17). Therefore, we only need to bound the last term. Unfortunately, this expression cannot be directly bounded by the energy (6.14). This is where we need to make use of the fact that there is the additional

room $0 < s - \frac{1}{2}$, which allows us to replace the $\tau_-^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ weight with the factor τ_-^{s-1} . We now prove the following estimate:

$$(6.21) \quad \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_-^{s-1} D_X^I \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \left(\|\tau_+^s(w)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{r} D_L(r D_X^I \phi)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \right. \\ \left. + \|\tau_-^s(w)^{\frac{1}{2}} D_{\underline{L}} D_X^I \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 + \|\tau_+^s(w)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{r} D_X^I \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \right).$$

This last line follows from Poincare estimate¹³ (6.8) with $p = 2s - 2$ and $q = 0$ along with the simple point-wise bound (note that the extra w_γ factor is just added in to match with R.H.S. (6.17) and is not needed for things to be sharp):

$$(6.22) \quad \tau_-^s \left| \frac{1}{r} D_r(r\phi) \right| \lesssim \left(\tau_+^s \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right| + \tau_-^s |D_{\underline{L}} \phi| + \tau_+^s \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \right) \cdot (w)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We have now completed our proof of estimate (6.19) above.

Estimate (6.15) for $\frac{\phi}{r}$ and $\mathcal{D}\phi$ in the region $t < 2r$. We begin with the undifferentiated estimate for $\frac{\phi}{r}$. Applying estimate (6.2) with $\delta_+ = s - 1$ and $\delta_- = 0$, and using the point-wise bound:

$$(6.23) \quad \sum_{X \in \{\partial_r, S, \Omega_{ij}, \Omega_{0r}\}} |D_X \phi| \lesssim \tau_+ \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right| + \tau_- |D_{\underline{L}} \phi| + \tau_+ \left(|\mathcal{D}\phi| + \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right| \right),$$

which follows easily from the expansions (2.32), we arrive at the L^∞ estimate:

$$(6.24) \quad \sup_{1 \leq t < 2r} \tau_+^{2s+2} \tau_- \left| \frac{\phi}{r} \right|^2 w_\gamma \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ Y \in \mathbb{O}}} \int_{t < 4r} \left(\tau_+^{2s} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r D_Y^I \phi) \right|^2 + \tau_-^{2s} |D_{\underline{L}}(D_Y^I \phi)|^2 \right. \\ \left. + \tau_+^{2s} (|\mathcal{D}(D_Y^I \phi)|^2 + \left| \frac{D_Y^I \phi}{r} \right|^2) \right) w_\gamma dx.$$

Notice that one can add another derivative to ϕ on the right hand side of (6.24) and still remain bounded by the energy $E_2^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}[\phi]$. Therefore we also have the desired bound for $\frac{D_X \phi}{r}$.

To bound the term $\mathcal{D}\phi$ we use the following point-wise estimate which is valid in the region $t \leq 2r$:

$$\tau_+ |\mathcal{D}\phi| \lesssim \sum_{i < j} |D_{\Omega_{ij}} \phi|,$$

and then employ estimate (6.24) with $\frac{\phi}{r}$ replaced by $\frac{D_{\Omega_{ij}} \phi}{r}$.

¹³We may assume that the $H^{1, s-1}$ norm of ϕ and $D_X \phi$ is finite or there is nothing to prove.

Improved L^∞ estimates for the term $\frac{\phi}{r}$ in the region $t < 2r$. This estimate follows from a simple combination of the global Sobolev and Poincare estimates as we now explain. First, we see that by applying (6.2) with $\delta_+ = 0$ and $\delta_- = s - 1$, and expanding out the fields ∂_r and Ω_{0r} , we have that:

$$\sup_{1 \leq t < 2r} \tau_+^2 \tau_-^{2s-1} |\phi|^2 w_\gamma \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{\partial_i, S, \Omega_{0i}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} \|\tau_-^{s-1}(w) \frac{1}{\gamma} D_X^I D_Y^J \phi\|_{L^2(t < 4r)} .$$

We are now finished by applying estimate (6.8) in the same way as used to prove (6.21) above, with the help of the point-wise bound (6.22) to convert the result into energy.

The $L^2(L^\infty)$ estimate for $\frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi)$. We'll begin here by estimating things in the region $1 < t < 2r$. Using estimate (6.2) with $\delta_+ = s$, $\delta_- = 0$ and the weight w_γ replaced by $w'_{\gamma,\epsilon}$ on each fixed time slice, we directly have the bound:

$$(6.25) \quad \|\tau_+^{s+1} \tau_-^{\frac{1}{2}}(w') \frac{1}{\gamma,\epsilon} \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi)\|_{L^2(L^\infty)[1,t_0] \cap \{t < 2r\}} \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{\partial_r, S, \Omega_{0r}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} \|\tau_+^s(w') \frac{1}{\gamma,\epsilon} D_X^I D_Y^J \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi)\|_{L^2(L^2)[1,t_0] \cap \{t < 4r\}} .$$

Keeping in mind now the space-time energy norm contained in $E_2^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi]$, we are finished once we have taken into account the commutator $[D_X^I D_Y^J, \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\cdot)]$. Because we are dealing with the component with the best decay properties, these commutators will need to be dealt with carefully. First, we use the formulas (1.5) and (2.31b) to compute the effect of the rotations (we also use the decomposition (3.12)):

$$(6.26a) \quad [D_{\Omega_{ij}}, \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\cdot)] = -\sqrt{-1} \Omega_{ij}^A \alpha_A ,$$

$$(6.26b) \quad \Omega_{kl}([D_{\Omega_{ij}}, \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\cdot)]) = -\sqrt{-1} \left(\Omega_{ij}^A \alpha_A (\mathcal{L}_{\Omega_{kl}} \tilde{F}) + \delta_{(lk} \Omega_{ij}^A \alpha_A \right) .$$

Similarly, using the formulas (5.19) and the fact that $\partial_r(\Omega_{ij}^A) = r^{-1} \Omega_{ij}^A$, we compute the effect of the fields $\{\partial_r, S, \Omega_{0r}\}$ to be:

$$(6.27a) \quad [D_r, \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\cdot)] = -\sqrt{-1} \rho - \frac{1}{r^2} ,$$

$$(6.27b) \quad [D_S, \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\cdot)] = \sqrt{-1} u \rho - \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\cdot) ,$$

$$(6.27c) \quad [D_{\Omega_{0r}}, \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\cdot)] = \sqrt{-1} u \rho + \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\cdot) + \frac{u}{r^2} ,$$

$$(6.27d) \quad \partial_r([D_{\Omega_{ij}}, \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\cdot)]) = -\sqrt{-1} \Omega_{ij}^A \left(\omega^k \alpha_A (\mathcal{L}_{\partial_k} \tilde{F}) + \frac{1}{r} \alpha_A \right) ,$$

$$(6.27e) \quad S([D_{\Omega_{ij}}, \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\cdot)]) = -\sqrt{-1} \Omega_{ij}^A \left(\alpha_A (\mathcal{L}_S \tilde{F}) - \alpha_A \right)$$

$$(6.27f) \quad \Omega_{0r}([D_{\Omega_{ij}}, \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\cdot)]) = -\sqrt{-1} \Omega_{ij}^A \left(\omega^k \alpha_A (\mathcal{L}_{\Omega_{0i}} \tilde{F}) - \frac{u}{r} \alpha_A \right) .$$

Combining the identities (6.26)–(6.27), and expanding out the fields ∂_r and Ω_{0r} using the identity $\underline{L}(\omega_i) = 0$ to move the contractions past the $\frac{1}{r}D_L(r\cdot)$ derivative, we arrive at the following point-wise bounds for the commutator in the region $1 \leq t < 2r$:

$$(6.28) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{\partial_r, S, \Omega_{0r}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} |D_X^I D_Y^J \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi)| \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{\partial_i, S, \Omega_{0i}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} |\frac{1}{r} D_L(r D_X^I D_Y^J \phi)| \\ & + \sum_{\substack{|I|+|J| \leq 1 \\ X, Y \in \mathbb{L}}} \tau_+ |\alpha(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F})| \cdot |D_Y^J \phi| + \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{O}}} \left(\tau_- |\rho| \cdot |D_X^I \phi| + \tau_0 \left| \frac{D_X^I \phi}{r} \right| \right). \end{aligned}$$

We now insert each term on the right hand side of (6.28) into the right hand side of estimate (6.25) and bound the result using the norms (3.47), (6.14), (4.21), and (6.15). Since there are some choices involved and the condition $\epsilon \leq s - \frac{1}{2}$ makes its appearance here we do this explicitly. Note that the first term on the right hand side of (6.28) is already of the right form so we move on to the second. For this term, we split cases depending on whether the derivatives are falling on α or ϕ . In the first case, we estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_+^{s+1}(w')^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\gamma, \epsilon} \cdot |\alpha(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F})| \cdot \phi\|_{L^2(L^2)[0, t_0]}^2, \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_+^s(w')^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\gamma, \epsilon} \alpha(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F})\|_{L^2(L^2)}^2 \cdot \|\tau_+ \phi\|_{L^\infty(L^\infty)[0, t_0]}^2, \\ & \lesssim E_1^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, t_0)[F] \cdot \|\phi\|_{L^\infty[0, t_0](s, \gamma \epsilon)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

In the second case, we use Hölders inequality to conclude that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_+^{s+1}(w')^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\gamma, \epsilon} \cdot |\alpha| \cdot D_X^I \phi\|_{L^2(L^2)[0, t_0]}^2, \\ & \lesssim \|\tau_+^{s+1} \tau_-^{\frac{1}{2}}(w')^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\gamma, \epsilon} \alpha\|_{L^2(L^\infty)[0, t_0]}^2 \cdot \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_-^{-\frac{1}{2}} D_X^I \phi\|_{L^\infty(L^2)[0, t_0]}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the first factor on this last line is contained in the norm (4.21). To bound the second factor on the last line above, we again use the extra room $\frac{1}{2} < s$ and apply the estimate (6.21).

It remains to deal with the last term on the right had side of (6.28). To handle this we expand $\rho = \tilde{\rho} + \bar{\rho}$. Using the identity (3.10), we see that we may combine the term $\tau_- \bar{\rho} D_X^I \phi$ with the second term in this expression. Notice that this is

automatically included in the energy (6.14). Thus, it suffices to use the bound:

$$\sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_+^s \tau_-(w')^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\gamma, \epsilon} \tilde{\rho} D_X^I \phi\|_{L^2(L^2)[0, t_0]}^2 \lesssim \\ ||| F |||_{L^\infty[0, t_0](s, \gamma, \epsilon)}^2 \cdot \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_-^{\frac{1}{2}}(w')^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\gamma, \epsilon} \frac{1}{r} D_X^I \phi\|_{L^2(L^2)[0, t_0]}^2 .$$

To control the second factor on the right hand side of this last expression, we simply use the condition $\epsilon \leq s - \frac{1}{2}$ which guarantees that $\tau_- \leq \tau_+^{2s} \tau_0^{1+2\epsilon}$. This concludes the $t < 2r$ estimate for $\frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi)$ in $L^2(L^\infty)$.

To wrap things up for this subsection, we need to deal with the $L^2(L^\infty)$ estimate in the deep interior region $r < \frac{1}{2}t$. In this case, it is just as easy to deal with the entire gradient $D\phi$ as we did in the first subsection of this proof. Therefore, the bound we seek to prove is the following:

$$(6.29) \quad \|\tau_+^{s+1-\epsilon} D\phi\|_{L^2(L^\infty)[1, t_0](r < \frac{1}{2}t)}^2 \lesssim E_2^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, t_0)[\phi] .$$

Using the $r < \frac{1}{2}t$ range restriction in conjunction with the point-wise bound:

$$(6.30) \quad C^{-1} \sum_{X \in \mathbb{L}} |D_X \phi| \leq \tau_- |D\phi| \leq C \sum_{X \in \mathbb{L}} |D_X \phi| ,$$

as well as the following interior Sobolev estimate on each fixed time slice (from (6.3) with $\delta^+ = s - \frac{3}{2} - \epsilon$):

$$\sup_{r < \frac{1}{2}t} \sum_{X \in \mathbb{L}} \tau_+^{s-\epsilon} |D_X \phi| \lesssim \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |I| \leq 3 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_+^{s-\frac{3}{2}-\epsilon} D_X^I \phi\|_{L_x^2(r < \frac{3}{2}t)} ,$$

we easily have fixed time bound:

$$\sup_{r < \frac{1}{2}t} \tau_+^{s+1-\epsilon} |D\phi| \lesssim \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |I| \leq 3 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_+^{s-\frac{3}{2}-\epsilon} D_X^I \phi\|_{L_x^2(r < \frac{3}{2}t)} .$$

By integrating the square of this last estimate over the time interval $(0, t_0)$, and again applying the point-wise bound (6.30), we arrive at the proof of (6.29) above. This completes our discussion of the $L^2(L^\infty)$ estimate in (6.16).

The pure L^∞ for $\frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi)$ in the region $t < 2r$. We begin here by applying estimate (6.4) to the term $\frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi)$ with $\delta_+ = s$. This yields the bound:

$$(6.31) \quad \sup_{(t, x) \in \tilde{C}(u)} \tau_+^{2s+3} \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right|^2 w_\gamma \lesssim \\ \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{S-\Omega_{0r}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} \|\tau_+^s(w)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\gamma} D_X^I D_Y^J \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi)\|_{L^2(\tilde{C}(u))} .$$

To deal with the commutator, we apply the identities (6.26)–(6.27) which provide the following refinement of (6.28):

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.32) \quad & \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{S-\Omega_{0r}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} |D_X^I D_Y^J \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi)| \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1, |J| \leq 2 \\ |I|+|J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \{S, \Omega_{0i}\}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} |\frac{1}{r} D_L(r D_X^I D_Y^J \phi)| \\
& + \sum_{\substack{|I|+|J| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{L} \\ Y \in \{S-\Omega_{0r}\} \cup \mathbb{O}}} \tau_+ |\alpha(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F})| \cdot |D_Y^J \phi| + \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{O}}} \left(|u| \cdot |\rho| \cdot |D_X^I \phi| + \left| \frac{u D_X^I \phi}{r^2} \right| \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that the weight τ_- appearing in (6.28) is replaced by $|u|$ in the last term on the right hand side of (6.32) above. This is because we do not have any term involving the radial derivative ∂_r to contend with on the left hand side. It is necessary to have this if we are to use the characteristic energy bound contained in (6.14). We now insert the terms on the right hand side of (6.32) into the right hand side of (6.31). Notice that the first such expression is automatically bounded by the energy (6.14). Therefore, it suffices to treat the last two groups of terms which we do in reverse order.

To bound the last group of terms on the right hand side of (6.32), we expand $\rho = \tilde{\rho} + \bar{\rho}$ and group the term $|u| \cdot |\bar{\rho}| \cdot D_X^I \phi$ with the term $r^{-2} |u| D_X^I \phi$ using the identity (3.10). The resulting term is contained in (6.14), so we are left with bounding:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_+^s \tau_-(w)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \cdot |\tilde{\rho}| \cdot D_X^I \phi\|_{L^2(\tilde{C}(u))}^2, \\
& \lesssim \|\tau_+^s(w)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \tilde{\rho}\|_{L^2(\tilde{C}(u))}^2 \cdot \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_+^s \tau_-^{1-s} D_X^I \phi\|_{L^\infty[0, t_0]}^2, \\
& \lesssim E^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}[F] \cdot \|\phi\|_{L^\infty[0, t_0](s, \gamma, \epsilon)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

To wrap things up here, we need to bound the middle set of terms on the right hand side of (6.32) substituted into the right hand side of (6.31). Dealing first with the term where the derivatives fall on α , we estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_+^{s+1}(w)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \cdot |\alpha(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F})| \cdot \phi\|_{L^2(\tilde{C}(u))}^2, \\
& \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_+^s(w)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \alpha(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F})\|_{L^2(\tilde{C}(u))}^2 \cdot \|\tau_+ \phi\|_{L^\infty(L^\infty)[0, t_0]}^2, \\
& \lesssim E_1^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, t_0)[F] \cdot \|\phi\|_{L^\infty[0, t_0](s, \gamma, \epsilon)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it remains to deal with the case where the derivatives fall on ϕ . Here we have to split cases depending on whether we have $D_Y \phi$ with $Y = S - \Omega_{0r}$, or

$Y \in \mathbb{O}$. In the first case, we write $Y = \underline{u}L$ and we expand:

$$|\underline{u}L\phi| \leq \tau_+ \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \right| + \frac{\tau_+}{r} |\phi| .$$

Using the fact that $t < 2r$ this allows us to estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} & \| \tau_+^{s+1}(w)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot |\alpha| \cdot D_{S-\Omega_{0r}} \phi \|_{L^2(\tilde{C}(u))}^2 , \\ & \lesssim \| \tau_+^s(w)^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha \|_{L^2(\tilde{C}(u))}^2 \cdot \left(\| \tau_+^2 \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \|_{L^\infty[0,t_0]}^2 + \| \tau_+ \phi \|_{L^\infty[0,t_0]}^2 \right) , \\ & \lesssim E_1^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,t_0)[F] \cdot \| \phi \|_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 . \end{aligned}$$

We are now left with estimating the expression $\sum_{Y \in \mathbb{O}} \tau_+^{s+1}(w)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot |\alpha| \cdot |D_Y \phi|$ in the space $L^2(\tilde{C}(u))$. This turns out to require an argument which is a bit more involved than what we have been doing so far. Notice that we cannot directly use either L^∞ or L^2 bounds on the $D_{\Omega_{ij}} \phi$ term. Furthermore, a Poincare estimate similar to (6.8) for light-cones will not work in this situation because it introduces boundary terms which cannot be controlled. Therefore, being unable to deal with things on the light-cone $\tilde{C}(u_0)$, we extend the integral to the exterior truncated time slab:

$$\mathcal{R}(u_0, t_0) = ([\max\{0, u_0\}, t_0] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \cap \{u \leq u_0\} .$$

Doing this via Stokes theorem yields the estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} (6.33) \quad & \sum_{Y \in \mathbb{O}} \| \tau_+^{s+1}(w)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot |\alpha| \cdot D_Y \phi \|_{L^2(\tilde{C}(u_0))}^2 \leq \\ & \sum_{Y \in \mathbb{O}} \left(\left| \int \int_{\mathcal{R}(u_0, t_0)} \tau_+^{2s+2} \underline{L}(|\alpha|^2 \cdot |D_Y \phi|^2) \, dx dt \right| \cdot w_\gamma(u_0) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \| \tau_+^{s+1}(w)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot |\alpha| \cdot D_Y \phi \|_{L^2(\{t=u_0\} \times \mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \right) . \end{aligned}$$

In the first term on the right hand side of the above expression, the weight $w_\gamma(u_0)$ denotes the constant value of the w_γ weight along the $\tilde{C}(u_0)$ cone. In the second term on the right hand side above we have switched to the variable w_γ weight, which is possible due to the fact that this is a non-decreasing function for $r \rightarrow \infty$. To bound this second term we estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{Y \in \mathbb{O}} \| \tau_+^{s+1}(w)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot |\alpha| \cdot D_Y \phi \|_{L^2(\{t=u_0\} \times \mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \lesssim \\ & \sum_{Y \in \mathbb{O}} \| F \|_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 \cdot \| \tau_+^{-\frac{1}{2}} D_Y \phi \|_{L^2(\{t=u_0\} \times \mathbb{R}^3)}^2 . \end{aligned}$$

We are now in the familiar territory where estimate (6.21) can be applied to the second factor on the right hand side above.

Moving on to the first term on the right hand side of (6.33), we expand the $\underline{L}$ derivative to bound:

$$(6.34) \quad \sum_{Y \in \mathbb{O}} \left| \int \int_{\mathcal{R}(u_0, t_0)} \tau_+^{2s+2} \underline{L}(|\alpha|^2 \cdot |D_Y \phi|^2) dx dt \right| \cdot w_\gamma(u_0) \leq \\ \sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathbb{O} \\ X \in \{\partial_r, \partial_t, S, \Omega_{0r}\}}} \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tau_+^{2s+2} \tau_-^{-1} |X(|\alpha|^2 \cdot |D_Y \phi|^2)| \cdot w_\gamma dx dt .$$

Using the formulas (5.19) and the fact that $\partial_t(\alpha_A) = \alpha_A(\mathcal{L}_{\partial_t} \tilde{F})$, we expand the sum:

$$(6.35) \quad \sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathbb{O} \\ X \in \{\partial_r, \partial_t, S, \Omega_{0r}\}}} |X(|\alpha|^2 \cdot |D_Y \phi|^2)| \lesssim \\ \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 2 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} |\alpha|^2 \cdot |D_X^I \phi|^2 + \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 1 \\ X \in \mathbb{O}, Y \in \mathbb{L}}} |\alpha| \cdot |\alpha(\mathcal{L}_Y \tilde{F})| \cdot |D_Y \phi|^2 .$$

Substituting the first term on the right hand side of (6.35) in the right hand integral in (6.34), and using the mixed norm estimate for α we bound:

$$\sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 2 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_+^{s+1} \tau_-^{-\frac{1}{2}}(w)_\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot |\alpha| \cdot D_X^I \phi\|_{L^2([0, t_0] \times \mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \lesssim \\ |||F|||_{L^\infty[0, t_0](s, \gamma, \epsilon)}^2 \cdot \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 2 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_-^{-\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon} D_X^I \phi\|_{L^\infty(L^2)[0, t_0]}^2 .$$

Using now the condition that $\epsilon \leq s - \frac{1}{2}$, we are in a position to again apply (6.21) noting that one may add an extra derivative to this estimate and still remain bounded in terms of $E_2^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, t_0)[\phi]$.

We have now reduced things to estimating the integral:

$$I = \sum_{X \in \mathbb{L}, Y \in \mathbb{O}} \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tau_+^{2s+2} \tau_-^{-1} |\alpha| \cdot |\alpha(\mathcal{L}_X \tilde{F})| \cdot |D_Y \phi|^2 \cdot w_\gamma dx dt .$$

Since this cannot be done directly, we use the identities:

$$|D_Y \phi|^2 = 2Y(\Re\langle \phi, D_Y \phi \rangle - 2\Re\langle \phi, D_Y^2 \phi \rangle) , \\ 2\Re\langle \phi, D_Y \phi \rangle = Y(|\phi|^2) .$$

to integrate by parts several times with respect to the $D_{\Omega_{ij}}$ derivatives to achieve the bound:

$$I \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I|, |J| \leq 2 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}, Y \in \mathbb{O}}} \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tau_+^{2s+2} \tau_-^{-1} |\alpha| \cdot |\alpha(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F})| \cdot |\phi| \cdot |D_Y^J \phi| \cdot w_\gamma dx dt \\ + \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq 2 \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tau_+^{2s+2} \tau_-^{-1} |\alpha(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F})|^2 \cdot |\phi|^2 \cdot w_\gamma dx dt , \\ = I_1 + I_2 .$$

To estimate the first integral on the right hand side above, we use a multiple Hölder inequality and the simple estimate $\tau_-^{-1} w_\gamma \leq \tau_-^{2\epsilon} w'_{\gamma,\epsilon}$ to conclude:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I|,|J|\leq 2 \\ X\in\mathbb{L}, Y\in\mathbb{O}}} \|\tau_+^{s+1} \tau_-^{\frac{1}{2}} (w')_{\gamma,\epsilon}^\frac{1}{2} \alpha \|_{L^2(L^\infty)[0,t_0]} \cdot \|\tau_+^s (w')_{\gamma,\epsilon}^\frac{1}{2} \alpha (\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F})\|_{L^2(L^2)[0,t_0]} \\ &\quad \cdot \|\tau_+ \tau_-^\epsilon \phi\|_{L^\infty[0,t_0]} \cdot \|\tau_-^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} D_Y^J \phi\|_{L^\infty(L^2)[0,t_0]} , \\ &\lesssim \left(\|\phi\|_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 + E_2^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[F] \right) \cdot \left(\|\phi\|_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 + E_2^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\phi] \right) . \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the passage to the last line above is guaranteed by the condition $\epsilon \leq s - \frac{1}{2}$ and the estimate (6.21). To estimate the second integral I_2 above, we proceed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I|\leq 2 \\ X\in\mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_+^s (w')_{\gamma,\epsilon}^\frac{1}{2} \alpha (\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F})\|_{L^2(L^2)[0,t_0]}^2 \cdot \|\tau_+ \tau_-^\epsilon \phi\|_{L^\infty[0,t_0]}^2 , \\ &\lesssim E_2^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[F] \cdot \|\phi\|_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 . \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the pure L^∞ bound for $\frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi)$ in the region $t < 2r$.

Combining all of the estimates proved in the various subsections above, we have proved the estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi\|_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 &\lesssim E_2^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[0,t_0][\phi] \cdot \left(1 + \|\phi\|_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 + E_2^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[0,t_0][F] \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\|\phi\|_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 + E_2^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[0,t_0][F] \right) \cdot \|\phi\|_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 . \end{aligned}$$

Using now the L^∞ estimate (5.6) for the curvature, we arrive at estimate (6.16). $\square$

7. ABSTRACT WEIGHT NOTATION AND THE BILINEAR SPACE-TIME ESTIMATES IN GENERAL FORM

In this section we will organize and consolidate the L^2 and L^∞ type estimates which have been proved in the preceding sections. This will help to streamline notation for the remainder of the paper, and will ultimately reduce a lot of overlapping which occurs in the commutator estimates needed to deal with the nonlinear problem (1.17). This will also give a chance for the reader to review the various notations, parameters, weights, etc. which have been introduced thus far. Our first order of business here is to set up some generic markers for the quantities which arise in the estimates we consider. These are the null components of the curvature F given by (2.23), the corresponding null decomposition of the gradient $D\phi$, and the weighted scalar field $\frac{\phi}{\tau_+}$. As we have already mentioned in Remark 4.3 above, there is a straightforward analogy between the different members of these sets. To

make this analogy precise we form the following sets of field quantities:

$$(7.1a) \quad \Psi_{(1)} = \{ \alpha, \frac{1}{r} D_L(r\phi) \chi_{t < 2r} + D_L \phi \chi_{r < \frac{1}{2}t} \}, \quad \Psi_{(-1)} = \{ \underline{\alpha}, D_{\underline{L}} \phi \},$$

$$(7.1b) \quad \Psi_{(0)} = \{ \tilde{\rho}, \sigma, \not{D}\phi, \sum_{|J| \leq 1, Y \in \mathbb{L}} \frac{D_Y^J \phi}{\tau_+} \}, \quad Q_{(0)} = \{ \bar{\rho} \}.$$

We will also use the following designation for sets containing the component decompositions of Lie derivatives of the various field quantities listed above:

$$(7.2a) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^k \Psi_{(1)} = \bigcup_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \{ \alpha(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F}), \frac{1}{r} D_L(r D_X^I \phi) \chi_{t < 2r} + D_L(D_X^I \phi) \chi_{r < \frac{1}{2}t} \},$$

$$(7.2b) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^k \Psi_{(0)} = \bigcup_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \{ \rho(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F}), \sigma(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F}), \not{D}(D_X^I \phi), \sum_{|J| \leq 1, Y \in \mathbb{L}} \frac{D_X^I D_Y^J \phi}{\tau_+} \},$$

$$(7.2c) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^k \Psi_{(-1)} = \bigcup_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \{ \underline{\alpha}(\mathcal{L}_X^I \tilde{F}), D_{\underline{L}}(D_X^I \phi) \},$$

$$(7.2d) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^k Q_{(1)} = \bigcup_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \{ \alpha(\mathcal{L}_X^I \bar{F}) \},$$

$$(7.2e) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^k Q_{(0)} = \bigcup_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \{ \rho(\mathcal{L}_X^I \bar{F}), \sigma(\mathcal{L}_X^I \bar{F}) \},$$

$$(7.2f) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^k Q_{(-1)} = \bigcup_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \{ \underline{\alpha}(\mathcal{L}_X^I \bar{F}) \}.$$

While it is true that the above objects are properly sets, they can be manipulated as if they were functions by making each designator stand for the absolute sum of each element in the set, and letting products of the various sets denote the absolute sum of products of each element in the corresponding sets. As a first application of this principle we use the above notation to recast the norms (3.47), (6.14), (4.21), and (6.15):

$$(7.3) \quad E_k^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, t_0)[\Psi] = E_k^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, t_0)[F] + E_k^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, t_0)[\phi],$$

$$(7.4) \quad \begin{aligned} ||| \Psi |||_{L^\infty[0, t_0](s, \gamma, \epsilon)}^2 &= |q(F)|^2 + \|\tau_+^{s+1} \tau_-^{\frac{1}{2}} (w')_{\gamma, \epsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Psi_{(1)}\|_{L^2(L^\infty)[0, t_0]}^2 \\ &\sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} (\tau_+^2 \tau_-^{2s-1} |\phi|^2 + \tau_+^{2s+3} |\Psi_{(1)}|^2 + \tau_+^2 \tau_-^{2s+1} |\Psi_{(-1)}|^2 + \tau_+^{2s+2} \tau_- |\Psi_{(0)}|^2) \cdot w_\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that we have included the extra L^∞ norm for ϕ on the right hand side of (7.4). This extra estimate turns out to be very important for us, but will be used in a somewhat auxiliary manner.

We can now write out the content of line (7.3) with the symbolic estimate (neglecting the characteristic energy terms which are only used to prove L^∞ estimates

and which don't quite fit into our scheme):

$$(7.5) \quad \begin{aligned} E_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0, t_0)[\Psi] &\geq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} \int_{\{t\} \times \mathbb{R}^3} (\tau_+^{2s} |\Psi_{(1)}|^2 + \tau_-^{2s} |\Psi_{(-1)}|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} |\Psi_{(0)}|^2) \cdot w_\gamma \, dx \\ &+ \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\tau_+^{2s} |\Psi_{(1)}|^2 + \tau_0^{1+2\epsilon} (\tau_-^{2s} |\Psi_{(-1)}|^2 + \tau_+^{2s} |\Psi_{(0)}|^2) \right) \cdot w'_{\gamma,\epsilon} \, dx dt . \end{aligned}$$

We can also write the L^∞ estimates (5.21)–(5.22), (5.6), and (6.16) in the following consolidated symbolic form:

Proposition 7.1 (L^∞ estimates for field quantities in abstract form). *Let $0 \leq t_0$ be a given fixed time, and let $0 < \gamma, \epsilon, s$ be parameters chosen so that $\epsilon \leq s - \frac{1}{2}$, then one has the following abstract non-linear L^∞ estimate for the field quantities $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^k \Psi$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^k Q$:*

$$(7.6) \quad \begin{aligned} ||| \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^k \Psi |||_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 &\lesssim E_{k+2}^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0, t_0)[\Psi] \cdot \left(1 + E_2^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0, t_0)[\Psi] \right) \\ &+ E_2^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0, t_0)[\Psi] \cdot ||| \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^k \Psi |||_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 , \end{aligned}$$

and:

$$(7.7a) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^k Q_{(1)} \leq C_k |q| \cdot \tau_0 \tau_+^{-2} \cdot \chi_{t < r+1} ,$$

$$(7.7b) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^k Q_{(0)} , \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^k Q_{(-1)} \leq C_k |q| \cdot \tau_+^{-2} \cdot \chi_{t < r+1} .$$

We now conclude this section by proving all of the estimates we will encounter in the rest of the paper in a simple abstract form. It turns out that everything we need can be cast in the language of L^2 bilinear space-time estimates. These in turn follow directly from Hölder's inequality and the L^2 and L^∞ type estimates contained in the right hand sides of (7.5) and (7.4)–(7.7b).

Proposition 7.2 (Weighted L^2 bilinear estimates for field quantities in abstract form). *Let $0 \leq t_0$ be a given fixed time, and let $0 < \gamma, \epsilon, s$ be parameters chosen so that $\epsilon \leq s - \frac{1}{2}$, and define the auxiliary weight:*

$$(7.8) \quad \tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon} = \tau_-^{2\gamma} \chi_{t < r} + \tau_-^{-\epsilon} \chi_{r < t} ,$$

then one has the following abstract estimates for field quantities Ψ and Φ :

$$(7.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\tau_+^{2s+1} \widetilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon} \Psi_{(1)} \cdot \Phi_{(0)}\|_{L^2[0,t_0]}^2 &\lesssim \\ &E_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,t_0)[\Psi_{(1)}] \cdot \|\Phi_{(0)}\|_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\tau_+^{2s+1} \widetilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon} \Psi_{(1)} \cdot \Phi_{(0)}\|_{L^2[0,t_0]}^2 &\lesssim \\ &E_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,t_0)[\Phi_{(0)}] \cdot \|\Psi_{(1)}\|_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\tau_+^{2s+\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} \tau_-^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \widetilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon} \Psi_{(0)} \cdot \Phi_{(0)}\|_{L^2[0,t_0]}^2 &\lesssim \\ &E_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,t_0)[\Psi_{(0)}] \cdot \|\Phi_{(0)}\|_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\tau_+^{s+1} \tau_-^s \widetilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon} \Psi_{(1)} \cdot \Phi_{(-1)}\|_{L^2[0,t_0]}^2 &\lesssim \\ &E_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,t_0)[\Psi_{(1)}] \cdot \|\Phi_{(-1)}\|_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\tau_+^{s+1} \tau_-^s \widetilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon} \Psi_{(1)} \cdot \Phi_{(-1)}\|_{L^2[0,t_0]}^2 &\lesssim \\ &E_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,t_0)[\Phi_{(-1)}] \cdot \|\Psi_{(1)}\|_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\tau_+^{s+\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} \tau_-^{s+\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \widetilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon} \Psi_{(0)} \cdot \Phi_{(-1)}\|_{L^2[0,t_0]}^2 &\lesssim \\ &E_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,t_0)[\Psi_{(0)}] \cdot \|\Phi_{(-1)}\|_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\tau_+^{s+\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} \tau_-^{s+\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \widetilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon} \Psi_{(0)} \cdot \Phi_{(-1)}\|_{L^2[0,t_0]}^2 &\lesssim \\ &E_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,t_0)[\Phi_{(-1)}] \cdot \|\Psi_{(0)}\|_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

Recalling the definition of the weight function w_γ from line (3.15), we also have the following space-time estimates for the interaction of the charge Q and the field quantity Ψ :

$$(7.16) \quad \|\tau_+^{s+\frac{5}{2}-\epsilon} \tau_-^{-1+\epsilon} (w_\gamma)^{\frac{1}{2}} Q_{(1)} \cdot \Psi_{(0)}\|_{L^2[0,t_0]} \lesssim |q|^2 \cdot E_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\Phi],$$

$$(7.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\tau_+^{s+\frac{3}{2}-\epsilon} \tau_-^\epsilon (w_\gamma)^{\frac{1}{2}} (Q_{(-1)} \cdot \Psi_{(0)} + Q_{(0)} \cdot \Psi_{(0)} + Q_{(1)} \cdot \Psi_{(-1)})\|_{L^2[0,t_0]} \\ \lesssim |q|^2 \cdot E_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\Phi], \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.18) \quad \|\tau_+^{\frac{3}{2}-\epsilon} \tau_-^{s+\epsilon} (w_\gamma)^{\frac{1}{2}} Q_{(0)} \cdot \Psi_{(-1)}\|_{L^2[0,t_0]} \lesssim |q|^2 \cdot E_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}[\Phi].$$

Remark 7.3. Since the proofs of these are a direct consequence of the estimates (7.5) and (7.4)–(7.7b) we simply make a few comments here. First of all, notice that the product estimates (7.10) and (7.13) must use the extra mixed space $L^2(L^\infty)$ norm on the right hand side of (7.4). For example, if in the latter one were instead to use the pure L^∞ estimate for $\Psi_{(1)}$ in conjunction with the space-time L^2 bound for $\Phi_{(-1)}$, there would be an additional need for a factor of τ_0^ϵ . As we shall see in Section 9, such an extra convergence factor is not available in our application where estimate (7.13) comes up (although it is merely a notational convenience where (7.10) arises). This is precisely the reason we have included the extra $L^2(L^\infty)$ norms. Thus, as far as our proof of Theorem 1.1 is concerned we never need to

make use of the pure L^∞ estimate for the quantity $\Psi_{(1)}$.

The second thing we call the readers attention to here is the fact that the estimates (7.16)–(7.18) will be used in their precise form for $2t < r$. Notice that there are no extra factors of τ_-^γ which can be put in these estimates as was the case for (7.9)–(7.15) above. From a technical point of view (aside from convenience), this is the reason it is necessary to have the exact space-time energy norms on the right hand side of (7.5). Without these, estimates of the form (7.16)–(7.18) would lead to logarithmic divergences which we see no other way of controlling.

Before we finish, we take one last look at the estimates (7.9)–(7.18). Our purpose is to recast these in such a way that they conform more closely to how they will be applied to estimate the system (1.17). In doing this, a surprisingly simple and elegant picture emerges of the underlying structure of the system (1.17). This reenforces our point of view that the complex scalar field can be treated as if it were a tensorial quantity with roughly the same properties as the curvature $F_{\alpha\beta}$. We will put this structure to use through the so called “parity condition”. This is a numerical device used to keep track of weights and components in contractions such as the right hand side of (2.17), which is typical of the kind of error terms we treat in the next two sections. It turns out that all of the estimates we will need can be reduced to a single streamlined form, the motivation for which will become a bit more clear through its use in the sequel.

Proposition 7.4 (Abstract parity form of the weighted bilinear L^2 estimates.). *Let $0 \leq t_0$ be a given fixed time, and let $0 < \gamma, \epsilon, s$ be parameters chosen so that $2\epsilon \leq s - \frac{1}{2}$. Recall the definition of the auxiliary weight $w_{\gamma,\epsilon}$ on line (3.16), and define the parity weights $w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(a)$ via the formulas:*

$$(7.19) \quad w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(1) = \tau_0^{-\epsilon} \cdot (w)_{\gamma,\epsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(0) = \tau_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (w)_{\gamma,\epsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(-1) = \tau_0^{2s-\epsilon} \cdot (w)_{\gamma,\epsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Also define the parity optical weights:

$$(7.20) \quad \tau_{(1)} = \tau_- , \quad \tau_{(0)} = \tau_{(-1)} = \tau_+ .$$

Then the following abstract bilinear L^2 estimate holds for the field quantities Ψ, Φ :

$$(7.21) \quad \|\tau_+^{s-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(a+b+c+d) \tau_{(a)}\tau_{(b)} \Psi_{(c)} \cdot \Phi_{(d)}\|_{L^2[0,t_0]}^2 \lesssim E_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0, t_0)[\Psi] \cdot \|\Phi\|_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 .$$

whenever the condition $-1 \leq a+b+c+d \leq 1$ holds. One also has the analogous estimate for the interaction of Q and Φ under the same condition on a, b, c, d :

$$(7.22) \quad \|\tau_+^{s-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(a+b+c+d) \tau_{(a)}\tau_{(b)} Q_{(c)} \cdot \Phi_{(d)}\|_{L^2[0,t_0]}^2 \lesssim |q|^2 \cdot E_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0, t_0)[\Phi] .$$

Proof of the estimates (7.21)–(7.22). We concentrate on the first estimate (7.21), the second being similar and much easier. First of all, we claim that this can be

reduced to the more restricted special case:

$$(7.23) \quad \|\tau_+^{s+\frac{1}{2}} w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(b+c+d) \tau_{(b)} \Psi_{(c)} \cdot \Phi_{(d)}\|_{L^2[0,t_0]}^2 \lesssim E_0^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,t_0)[\Psi] \cdot \|\Phi\|_{L^\infty[0,t_0](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2,$$

where now we impose the two conditions:

$$(7.24) \quad -1 \leq c+d \leq 1, \quad -1 \leq b+c+d \leq 1.$$

Notice that (7.23) implies (7.21) with these extra conditions enforced because in that case one simply has the bound:

$$w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(a+b+c+d) \cdot \tau_+^{-1} \cdot \tau_{(a)} \leq w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(b+c+d),$$

as long as we are not in the case where both $a = 1$ and $b+c+d = -1$. If this happens, we see from the previous conditions that $b = -1, 0$ so we can use the bound:

$$w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(a+b+c+d) \cdot \tau_+^{-1} \cdot \tau_{(a)} \tau_{(b)} \leq w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(b+c+d+1) \cdot \tau_{(b+1)},$$

which holds in this case. Replacing now $b' = b+1$ we are back to the case of (7.23)–(7.24).

To derive the estimate (7.21) in the case where $c+d = -1$ and $b = -1$, notice that one must then have $a = 1$. In this case the bound $\tau_+^{-1} \tau_{(1)} \leq 1$ reduces things to (7.23) with $c+d = -1$ and $b = 0$. The case $c+d = 1$, $b = 1$, $a = -1$ can be treated similarly.

To derive (7.21) in the case where $c = d = -1$, we use the symbolic inequality:

$$\tau_+^{-1} \tau_{(1)} \Psi_{(-1)} \leq \Psi_{(0)},$$

which puts us in a position where we may again apply (7.23) under the conditions (7.24).

To deal with (7.21) in the extreme case where $c = d = 1$, we simply use the fact that while it is not listed in the estimates (7.9)–(7.15), the product $\Psi_{(1)} \cdot \Phi_{(1)}$ is so favorable that it satisfies the space-time L^2 estimate (7.21) for any of the weights $w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(a)$.

It now remains to prove (7.23) under the conditions (7.24). This involves a simple case by case analysis split along the value of $c+d$:

Case: $c+d = 1$. In this case we can either have $b = -1$ or $b = 0$. In either case the $\tau_{(b)}$ weight is the same, so it suffices to consider the case which maximizes the weight $w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(b+c+d)$. In this case we are dealing with $w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(1)$. Substituting this into estimate (7.23), and using the bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_+^{s+\frac{1}{2}} w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(1) \tau_{(0)} &= \tau_+^{s+\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon} \tau_-^{-\epsilon} (w)_{\gamma,\epsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ &\lesssim \tau_+^{2s+1} \tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

which holds due to the condition $2\epsilon \leq s - \frac{1}{2}$, we see that the desired result follows from estimates (7.9)–(7.10) above.

Case: $c + d = 0$. In this case, we can have all choices $-1 \leq b \leq 1$. It suffices to consider the one which maximizes the product $w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(b) \cdot \tau_{(b)}$ which is easily seen to be $b = 0$. In this case we compute the total weight in estimate (7.23) to be:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_+^{s+\frac{1}{2}} w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(0) \tau_{(0)} &= \tau_+^{s+1} \tau_-^{\frac{1}{2}}(w)_{\gamma,\epsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ &\lesssim \tau_+^{s+1} \tau_-^s \tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon}, \\ &\lesssim \tau_+^{2s+\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} \tau_-^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last two inequalities follow from the condition $2\epsilon \leq s - \frac{1}{2}$. We are now in a position to directly apply estimates (7.11)–(7.13).

Case: $c+d=-1$. In this case we can have either $b = 1$ or $b = 0$ so it suffices to consider the one which maximizes the product $w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(b-1) \cdot \tau_{(b)}$. This turns out to depend on the value of $\frac{1}{2} < s \leq 1$. If it is the case that $\frac{3}{4} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} < s$, then the choice $b = 1$ maximizes the product in which case we are dealing with the total weight:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_+^{s+\frac{1}{2}} w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(0) \tau_{(1)} &= \tau_+^s \tau_-^{\frac{3}{2}}(w)_{\gamma,\epsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ &\lesssim \tau_+^{s+\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} \tau_-^{s+\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the inequality on the last line follows simply from the condition $\frac{1}{2} < s$ and the fact that we may assume $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

If on the other hand it is the case that $s \leq \frac{3}{4} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, then the choice $b = 0$ maximizes the product $w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(b-1) \cdot \tau_{(b)}$ in which case we are dealing with the total weight:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_+^{s+\frac{1}{2}} w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(-1) \tau_{(0)} &= \tau_+^{\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon-s} \tau_-^{2s-\epsilon}(w)_{\gamma,\epsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ &\lesssim \tau_+^{s+\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} \tau_-^{s+\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \tilde{w}_{\gamma,\epsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

where, as before, the inequality is guaranteed by the condition $2\epsilon \leq s - \frac{1}{2}$. Substituting this last line into estimate (7.23) we can then directly apply estimates (7.14)–(7.15). This completes our proof of (7.21). $\square$

8. DIFFERENTIATING THE FIELD EQUATIONS I: ERROR ESTIMATES FOR THE CURVATURE $F_{\alpha\beta}$

We are now ready to begin in earnest our proof of Theorem 1.1. We assume that we have fixed some level of regularity for the problem, say k derivatives with $2 \leq k$. The result will be demonstrated through a bootstrapping argument on the energy (7.3). Recalling the definition of the norms for the initial data on the left hand side of (1.25), we define:

$$\begin{aligned} (8.1) \quad E_k^{(s,\gamma)}(0)[F, \phi] &= \|E^{df}\|_{H^{k,s+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 + \|H\|_{H^{k,s+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 + \\ &\quad \|\underline{D}\phi_0\|_{H^{k,s+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 + \|\dot{\phi}_0\|_{H^{k,s+\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We will now show that:

Theorem 8.1 (Bootstrapping form of Theorem 1.1). *Let k be a given level of regularity, and assume that we are given parameters $0 < s, \gamma, \epsilon$ with the properties that $s \leq 1$, and $4\epsilon \leq s - \frac{1}{2}$, and $s + \gamma < \frac{3}{2}$. Let $0 < T$ be a given time parameter, and let Ψ denote the totality of components of the system (1.17) as defined by (7.2) with the associated k^{th} level energy content (7.3). Let $E_k^{(s, \gamma)}(0)[F, \phi]$ denote the initial k^{th} level energy content in the initial data (1.18). Then there exists a constant $1 \leq C_{k, s, \gamma, \epsilon}$ which depend only on k, s, ϵ, γ , but not on T , such that if one first assumes that both:*

$$(8.2) \quad E_2^{(s, \gamma)}(0)[F, \phi], \quad E_2^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, T)[\Psi] \leq C_{k, s, \gamma, \epsilon}^{-1},$$

then the following nonlinear estimate also holds:

$$(8.3) \quad E_k^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, T)[\Psi] \leq C_{k, s, \gamma, \epsilon} \left(E_k^{(s, \gamma)}(0)[F, \phi] + \sum_{l=2}^7 \left[E_k^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, T)[\Psi] \right]^l \right).$$

In particular, we see from Theorem 8.1 that the assumptions:

$$E_k^{(s, \gamma)}(0)[F, \phi] \leq \frac{1}{8} C_{k, s, \gamma, \epsilon}^{-2}, \quad E_k^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, T)[\Psi] \leq \frac{1}{2} C_{k, s, \gamma, \epsilon}^{-1},$$

together imply that:

$$E_k^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, T)[\Psi] \leq \frac{1}{4} C_{k, s, \gamma, \epsilon}^{-1}.$$

This, combined with the usual local existence theorem for the system (1.17), and keeping in mind the main L^∞ estimate (7.6) (assuming that $C_{k, s, \gamma, \epsilon}$ is chosen so large that the condition (8.2) allows one to absorb the extra L^∞ terms on the right hand side of this estimate) implies the claim of Theorem 1.1. Therefore, for the remainder of this paper we will assume that the solution exists up to time T and we will concentrate on proving the non-linear a-priori estimate (8.3).

In this section we concentrate on proving (8.3) for the portion of Ψ which contains the curvature. By the energy estimate (3.48), this boils down to estimating the differentiated current vector $\mathcal{L}_X^I J$ at time $t = 0$, as well as over the space-time slab $[0, T]$. We do this separately. For the latter it suffices to be able to prove the following bounds:

Proposition 8.2 (Space-time error bounds for the curvature $F_{\alpha\beta}$). *Let k be a given level of regularity, and assume that we are given parameters $0 < s, \gamma, \epsilon$ with the properties that $s \leq 1$, and $2\epsilon \leq s - \frac{1}{2}$, and $s + \gamma < \frac{3}{2}$. Let $0 < T$ be a given time parameter, and let:*

$$J = \Im(\phi \overline{D\phi}),$$

be the current vector for the system (1.17). Recall the current vector norm (3.40). Then there exists a constant $1 \leq C_{k, s, \gamma, \epsilon}$ depending only on k, s, ϵ, γ , such that if:

$$(8.4) \quad E_2^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, T)[\Psi] \leq C_{k, s, \gamma, \epsilon}^{-1},$$

then one has the following weighted space-time estimate:

$$(8.5) \quad \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} ||| \mathcal{L}_X^I J |||_{L^2[0, T](s, \gamma, \epsilon)}^2 \lesssim \sum_{l=2}^5 \left[E_k^{(s, \gamma, \epsilon)}(0, T)[\Psi] \right]^l.$$

Proof of estimate (8.5). In light of the abstract L^∞ estimate (7.6) and the assumption (8.4) with the constant $C_{k,s,\gamma,\epsilon}^{-1}$ chosen small enough that the right hand side of (7.6) containing the extra L^∞ norm can be absorbed into the left hand side, it suffices to be able to show that:

$$(8.6) \quad \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} ||| \mathcal{L}_X^I J |||_{L^2[0,T](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 \lesssim E_k^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,T)[\Psi] \cdot ||| \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{k-2} \Psi |||_{L^\infty[0,T](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 \left(1 + ||| \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{k-2} \Psi |||_{L^\infty[0,T](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 \right),$$

where $||| \mathcal{L}_X^I J |||_{L^2[0,T](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}$ is the notation from line (3.40) above. Expanding out the norm on the left hand side of this estimate, and using the weight notation (7.19) we see that:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} ||| \mathcal{L}_X^I J |||_{L^2[0,T](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 &= \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \left(\| \tau_+^{s+\frac{1}{2}} w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(1) (\mathcal{L}_X^I J)_L \|_{L^2[0,T]}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \| \tau_+^{s+\frac{1}{2}} w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(0) \mathcal{L}_X^I J \|_{L^2[0,T]}^2 + \| \tau_+^{s+\frac{1}{2}} w_{\gamma,\epsilon}(-1) (\mathcal{L}_X^I J)_{\underline{L}} \|_{L^2[0,T]}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we are using the notation $|\mathcal{L}_X^I J|^2 = \delta^{AB} (\mathcal{L}_X^I J)_A \cdot (\mathcal{L}_X^I J)_B$. Therefore, using the abstract parity estimates (7.21) in the form of estimate (7.23) as well as estimate (7.22), it suffices to prove the following symbolic bounds:

$$(8.7) \quad \begin{aligned} &\sum_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} |(\mathcal{L}_X^I J)_L| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{l+m=k-1 \\ \text{or } l=0, m=k \\ \text{and } a+b+c=1}} \tau_{(a)} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l \Psi_{(b)} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l Q_{(b)} \right) \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^m \Psi_{(c)} \cdot \left(1 + ||| \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{k-2} \Psi |||_{L^\infty[0,T](s,\gamma,\epsilon)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

$$(8.8) \quad \begin{aligned} &\sum_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} |(\mathcal{L}_X^I J)_{\underline{L}}| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{l+m=k-1 \\ \text{or } l=0, m=k \\ \text{and } a+b+c=-1}} \tau_{(a)} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l \Psi_{(b)} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l Q_{(b)} \right) \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^m \Psi_{(c)} \cdot \left(1 + ||| \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{k-2} \Psi |||_{L^\infty[0,T](s,\gamma,\epsilon)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

$$(8.9) \quad \begin{aligned} &\sum_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} |\mathcal{L}_X^I J| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{l+m=k-1 \\ \text{or } l=0, m=k \\ \text{and } a+b+c=0}} \tau_{(a)} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l \Psi_{(b)} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l Q_{(b)} \right) \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^m \Psi_{(c)} \cdot \left(1 + ||| \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{k-2} \Psi |||_{L^\infty[0,T](s,\gamma,\epsilon)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We will only prove the bounds (8.7)–(8.9) in the extended exterior region $t < 2r$. These bounds in the complimentary region $r < \frac{1}{2}t$ follow from similar reasoning and are in fact much simpler because the weights $\tau_{(a)}$ are all identical there.

Our first step is the following simple inductive calculation of the Lie derivative $\mathcal{L}_X^I J$ which is based on repeated use of the formula (2.15):

$$\begin{aligned}
 (8.10) \quad \mathcal{L}_X^I J &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{\substack{K_1+K_2=I \\ X_1, X_2 \in \mathbb{L}}} \left(D_{X_1}^{K_1} \phi \cdot \overline{\mathcal{L}_{X_2}^{\mathbb{C}^{K_2}} D \phi} \right) + \left(D_{X_2}^{K_2} \phi \cdot \overline{\mathcal{L}_{X_1}^{\mathbb{C}^{K_1}} D \phi} \right), \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{\substack{K_1+K_2=I \\ X, Y \in \mathbb{L}}} \left(D_{X_1}^{K_1} \phi \cdot \overline{D(D_{X_2}^{K_2} \phi)} \right) + \left(D_{X_2}^{K_2} \phi \cdot \overline{D(D_{X_1}^{K_1} \phi)} \right) \\
 &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{\substack{K_1+K_2=I \\ X_1, X_2 \in \mathbb{L}}} \left(D_{X_1}^{K_1} \phi \cdot \overline{[\mathcal{L}_{X_2}^{\mathbb{C}^{K_2}}, D] \phi} \right) + \left(D_{X_2}^{K_2} \phi \cdot \overline{[\mathcal{L}_{X_1}^{\mathbb{C}^{K_1}}, D] \phi} \right), \\
 &= A + B.
 \end{aligned}$$

We now compute each of the A and B terms on the right hand side of the above identities separately. Each of these terms can be seen as real valued two forms, and we denote their components by A_α and B_α respectively.

To compute the A term, notice that since the sum is symmetric in the K_1 and K_2 multiindices, we may replace the D_L derivative by $\frac{1}{r} D_L(r \cdot)$ in the A_L component. Doing this, and putting absolute values around the different components of A while using the condition $|I| \leq k$ we have the bounds:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (8.11) \quad |A_L| &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{|K|=k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \tau_+ \left| \frac{\phi}{\tau_+} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r D_X^K \phi) \right| \\
 &\quad + \sum_{\substack{|K_1|+|K_2| \leq k-1 \\ X_1, X_2, Y \in \mathbb{L}}} |D_Y D_{X_1}^{K_1} \phi| \cdot \left| \frac{1}{r} D_L(r D_{X_2}^{K_2} \phi) \right|,
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (8.12) \quad |A_{\underline{L}}| &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{|K|=k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \tau_+ \left| \frac{\phi}{\tau_+} \right| \cdot |D_{\underline{L}}(D_X^K \phi)| \\
 &\quad + \sum_{\substack{|K_1|+|K_2| \leq k-1 \\ X_1, X_2, Y \in \mathbb{L}}} |D_Y(D_{X_1}^{K_1} \phi)| \cdot |D_{\underline{L}}(D_{X_2}^{K_2} \phi)|,
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (8.13) \quad |A| &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{|K|=k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \tau_+ \left| \frac{\phi}{\tau_+} \right| \cdot |\mathcal{D}(D_X^K \phi)| \\
 &\quad + \sum_{\substack{|K_1|+|K_2| \leq k-1 \\ X_1, X_2, Y \in \mathbb{L}}} |D_Y(D_{X_1}^{K_1} \phi)| \cdot |\mathcal{D}(D_{X_2}^{K_2} \phi)|.
 \end{aligned}$$

For the first term in each of the above sums, it suffices to merely recall the designations (7.1)–(7.2) and the definition of the parity weights $\tau_{(a)}$ to achieve the bounds (8.7)–(8.9). To achieve these bounds for the second term on each line (8.11)–(8.13)

above, it suffices to show the bounds:

$$\sum_{\substack{|K_1| \leq l \\ X_1, Y \in \mathbb{L}}} |D_Y(D_{X_1}^{K_1} \phi)| \lesssim \sum_{a+b=0} \tau_{(a)} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l \Psi_{(b)} .$$

This last line follows from a straight forward application of the bounds:

$$(8.14) \quad |X^L|, |X^A| \lesssim \tau_+, \quad |X^{\underline{L}}| \lesssim \tau_-, \quad X \in \mathbb{L} ,$$

which follows from an inspection of the identities (2.32), together with the designations (7.1)–(7.2) and the weight definition (7.20).

We now move on to dealing with the B portion of identity (8.10). This boils down to computing the commutator actions $[\mathcal{L}_X^{\mathbb{C}^K}, D]\phi$. By a repeated use of the formula (2.14) and the fact that $\mathbb{L}$ is a Lie algebra (so all its commutators involve constant coefficient sums), we easily have the bounds:

$$(8.15) \quad |B_\alpha| \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|K_1|+|K_2|+|K_3| \leq |I|-1 \\ X_1, X_2, X_3, Y \in \mathbb{L}}} |(i_Y \mathcal{L}_{X_1}^{K_1} F)_\alpha| \cdot |D_{X_2}^{K_2} \phi| \cdot |D_{X_3}^{K_3} \phi| .$$

We now use the fact that either $|K_2| \leq k-2$ or $|K_3| \leq k-2$ which comes from the restriction given above on their sum, to employ the L^∞ estimate for $D_X^K \phi$ contained in (7.6) to bound the product of the second and third factor in this last sum as follows:

$$|D_{X_2}^{K_2} \phi| \cdot |D_{X_3}^{K_3} \phi| \lesssim \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{\max\{|K_2|, |K_3|\}} \Psi_{(0)} \cdot \|\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{k-2} \Psi\|_{L^\infty[0,T](s,\gamma,\epsilon)} .$$

Therefore, to achieve the right hand side of (8.7)–(8.9) for the B term it suffices to show the bounds:

$$(8.16) \quad \sum_{\substack{|K| \leq l \\ X, Y \in \mathbb{L}}} |(i_Y \mathcal{L}_X^K F)_L| \lesssim \sum_{a+b=1} \tau_{(a)} (\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l \Psi_{(b)} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l Q_{(b)}) ,$$

$$(8.17) \quad \sum_{\substack{|K| \leq l \\ X, Y \in \mathbb{L}}} |(i_Y \mathcal{L}_X^K F)_{\underline{L}}| \lesssim \sum_{a+b=-1} \tau_{(a)} (\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l \Psi_{(b)} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l Q_{(b)}) ,$$

$$(8.18) \quad \sum_{\substack{|K| \leq l \\ X, Y \in \mathbb{L}}} \sum_A |(i_Y \mathcal{L}_X^K F)_A| \lesssim \sum_{a+b=0} \tau_{(a)} (\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l \Psi_{(b)} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l Q_{(b)}) .$$

Splitting $\mathcal{L}_X^K F = \mathcal{L}_X^K \tilde{F} + \mathcal{L}_X^K \overline{F}$ we see that it suffices to do this calculation for the $\tilde{F}$ portion of things because the same computation for the charge field $\overline{F}$ is identical. Since this is an abstract counting argument for an arbitrary two form we can drop the Lie derivatives and the tilde notation. Making now the identifications:

$$(8.19) \quad L \Leftrightarrow (1) , \quad \underline{L} \Leftrightarrow (-1) , \quad A, B \Leftrightarrow (0) ,$$

we see that in the groupings (7.1)–(7.2) the component $F_{\alpha\beta}$ is put in the set that corresponds to the sum of α and β (according to the numerical designations (8.19)) as they range over the null frame $\{L, \underline{L}, e_A\}$. Using this observation in conjunction with the bound (8.14) and the weight definitions (7.20), it is seen that the estimates (8.16)–(8.18) are an immediate consequence of translating the contractions $X^\beta F_{\alpha\beta}$,

computed in a null frame, into the more simple numerical parity sum form. This completes the proof of the estimate (8.5). $\square$

To complete the proof of the bootstrapping estimate (8.3) for the electro-magnetic field $F_{\alpha\beta}$, it suffices to be able to bound the initial data type norms for the current vector J given on the right hand side of (3.48) in terms of the energy (8.1). To do this it is enough to show:

Proposition 8.3 (Initial data bounds for the system (1.17)). *Let $2 \leq k$ be a given level of regularity, and assume that we are given parameters $0 < \gamma$, and $\frac{1}{2} < s$, and $s + \gamma < \frac{3}{2}$. Let (F, ϕ) be a solution to the system (1.17) with initial data $(E, H, \phi_0, \dot{\phi}_0)$. Then there exists a constant C_{k,s_0} such that if one first assumes the smallness condition:*

$$(8.20) \quad E_k^{(s,\gamma)}(0)[F, \phi] \leq C_{k,s,\gamma,\epsilon}^{-1},$$

then one has the initial bounds:

$$(8.21) \quad \sum_{|I| \leq k} \|(1+r)^{s+\gamma+|I|} \nabla_x^I J_0(0)\|_{L_x^{\frac{6}{5}}}^2 + \sum_{|I| \leq k-1} \|(1+r)^{s+\gamma+|I|+1} \nabla_{t,x}^I J(0)\|_{L_x^2}^2 \lesssim \left[E_k^{(s,\gamma)}(0)[F, \phi] \right]^2.$$

Proof of the estimate (8.21). We begin by bounding the first term on the left hand side of (8.21). At time $t = 0$ we directly compute that in terms of the initial data:

$$(8.22) \quad \sum_{|I|=l} |\nabla_x^I J_0| \lesssim \sum_{|K_1|+|K_2|=l} |\underline{D}^{K_1} \phi_0| \cdot |\underline{D}^{K_2} \dot{\phi}_0|.$$

This, combined with the two L^∞ estimates:

$$(8.23) \quad (1+r)^{s+\gamma+\frac{1}{2}} |\phi_0| \lesssim \sum_{|I| \leq 1} \|(1+r)^{s+\gamma+|I|} \underline{D}^I \underline{D} \phi_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)},$$

$$(8.24) \quad (1+r)^{s+\gamma+\frac{3}{2}} |\dot{\phi}_0| \lesssim \sum_{|I| \leq 2} \|(1+r)^{s+\gamma+|I|} \underline{D}^I \dot{\phi}_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)},$$

which in turn follow for the estimates (6.5)–(6.6), achieves the bound (8.21) for this first term through a use of the $L^2 \cdot L^3$ Hölder inequality and directly integrating the resulting L^3 estimate using (8.23)–(8.24) and the fact that $\frac{1}{2} < s + \gamma$.

To estimate the second term on the left hand side of (8.21), we first expand the derivatives $\nabla_{t,x} J$ as we did in line (8.22) above. Doing this and using the L^∞ estimate:

$$(8.25) \quad \sum_{\substack{|K| \leq k-1 \\ X \in \{\partial_\alpha\}}} (1+r)^{1+|K|} |D_X^K \phi| \lesssim \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |I_1|+|I_2| \leq k+1 \\ Y \in \{\partial_i\}, X \in \{\partial_\alpha\}}} \|(1+r)^{s+\gamma-1+|I_1|+|I_2|} D_Y^{I_1} D_X^{I_2} \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)},$$

which follows from the estimate (6.5) applied to functions of the form $(1+r)^{|K|} D_X^K \phi$ and the fact that $1 < \frac{1}{2} + s + \gamma$ as well as $\frac{1}{2} < s + \gamma$, we are reduced to having to

demonstrate the general estimate:

$$(8.26) \quad \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |I| \leq k+1 \\ X \in \{\partial_\alpha\}}} \|(1+r)^{s+\gamma-1+|I|} D_X^I \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \lesssim E_k^{(s,\gamma)}(0)[F] ,$$

holds, provided that one first assumes the smallness condition (8.20) as well as the condition $2 \leq k$.

It is clear that the work in showing (8.26) is simply a matter of eliminating the D_t derivative in favor of D_i derivatives. This in turn boils down to controlling the commutators of the form $[D_t, \underline{D}^I]$ because our goal is to move the D_t operator as far to the right as possible and then to use the field equation (1.2). While this overall strategy is simple to describe, the implementation becomes a bit tedious because the commutator formula (1.5) introduces the field electric E_i which must then be differentiated many times.

The simplest way to deal with all of this seems to be to fix a value for k and then to induct on the number of D_t derivatives on the left hand side of this estimate. If this number is zero then the claim is obvious, so we may now fix the number at some value $1 \leq l \leq k+1$. Our goal is to prove the bound:

$$(8.27) \quad \|(1+r)^{s+\gamma-1+|I|} D_X^{K_1} D_t D_Y^{K_2} \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \lesssim E_k^{(s,\gamma)}(0)[F] ,$$

where $|K_1| + |K_2| \leq |I| - 1$ and $X \in \{\partial_\alpha\}$ while $Y \in \{\partial_i\}$. By induction, we may assume that the same estimate holds with the D_t derivative replaced by one of D_i . In this regard it will be useful for us to employ the following notation: If K is a multiindex, then we denote by $|K^0|$ the number of time derivatives in the operator D_X^K (note that we are only working with $X \in \{\partial_\alpha\}$ now). With this convention, we have that $|K_1^0| \leq l-1$ in (8.27) above. Now, computing some multiple commutators we have the point-wise bound:

$$(8.28) \quad |D_X^{K_1} D_t D_Y^{K_2} \phi| \lesssim |D_X^{K_1} D_Y^{K_2} D_t \phi| + \sum_{\substack{|I_1|+|I_2|=|K_2|-1 \\ X \in \{\partial_\alpha\} \\ Y_1, Y_2, Z \in \{\partial_i\}}} |D_X^{K_1} D_{Y_1}^{I_1} [D_t, D_Z] D_{Y_2}^{I_2} \phi| .$$

We estimate the second term in the above expression first. Substituting this into the left hand side of (8.27) and expanding out the single commutator in terms of the electric field E_i , distributing the left hand derivatives according to the covariant Leibnitz rule, using the field equations (1.10) to remove time derivatives from E , and splitting result along the Hodge decomposition $E = E^{df} + E^{cf}$ we have the

bound:

(8.29)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\substack{|K_1^0| \leq l-1 \\ |K_2|+|I_1|+|I_2| \leq k-1 \\ X \in \{\partial_\alpha\} \\ Y_1, Y_2, Z \in \{\partial_i\}}} \|(1+r)^{s+\gamma+1+|I_1|+|I_2|} D_X^{K_1} D_{Y_1}^{I_1} [D_t, D_Z] D_{Y_2}^{I_2} \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} , \\
& \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I_1|+|I_2| \leq k-1 \\ |I_2^0| \leq l-1 \\ X \in \{\partial_\alpha\}}} \left(\|(1+r)^{s+\gamma+1+|I_1|+|I_2|} (\nabla_x^{I_1} E^{df}) \cdot (D_X^{I_2} \phi)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|(1+r)^{s+\gamma+1+|I_1|+|I_2|} (\nabla_x^{I_1} H) \cdot (D_X^{I_2} \phi)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \right) \\
& \quad + \|(1+r)^{s+\gamma+1+|I_1|+|I_2|} (\nabla_x^{I_1} E^{cf}) \cdot (D_X^{I_2} \phi)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \Big) \\
& \quad + \sum_{\substack{|I_1|+|I_2| \leq k-2 \\ |I_1^0|+|I_2^0| \leq l-1 \\ X \in \{\partial_i\}}} \|(1+r)^{s+\gamma+2+|I_1|+|I_2|} (\nabla_{t,x}^{I_1} J) \cdot (D_X^{I_2} \phi)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} , \\
& = A + B + C .
\end{aligned}$$

We now bound each of the three terms on the right hand side above separately. For the A term we are done by induction after a simple use of the L^∞ estimate (8.25).

To bound the B term, we add and subtract off the term $\nabla_x \frac{1}{2\pi r} \cdot \chi^+(r-2)$ from the curl-free component E^{cf} . Then using the estimate (3.53) in conjunction with the bounds we have already established for the first term on the left hand side of (8.21), and by making another use of the estimate (8.25) this we are reduced to showing that:

$$\sum_{\substack{|I_2| \leq k-1 \\ |I_2^0| \leq l-1 \\ X \in \{\partial_\alpha\}}} \|(1+r)^{s+\gamma-1+|I_2|} D_X^{I_2} \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \lesssim E_k(0)^{(s,\gamma)}[\phi, F] .$$

But this last estimate follows from our inductive hypothesis unless $I_2 = 0$ in the sum. In this latter case we can use the Poincare estimate (6.7) to make our claim.

Our next task here is to prove the (inductive) bound (8.21) for the C term on the right hand side of line (8.29) above. As before, we use the estimate (8.25) to deal with the factor involving $(1+r)^{1+|I_2|} D_X^{I_2} \phi$. Doing this and making use of the continuity equation (1.16) and the smallness condition (8.20), we arrive at the bound (as long as $0 < l-1$):

$$C \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|I_1| \leq k-2 \\ |I_1^0| \leq l-2}} \|(1+r)^{s+\gamma+1+|I_1|} \nabla_{t,x}^{I_1} J(0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} .$$

We can now reduced things to the point where we can go back to the paragraph containing line (8.25) above and repeat the entire argument up to this point which

allows one to bound the right hand side of this last expression via induction.

To finish here, we only need to deal with the first term on the left hand side of (8.28). First of all, if it is the case that $|K_1^0| = 0$ then we are automatically done. If however $1 \leq |K_1^0|$ then we simply repeat the steps outlined above for the second term on the right hand side (8.28), but this time applied to the second term on the right hand side of the bound:

$$(8.30) \quad |D_X^{\tilde{K}_1} D_t D_Y^{K_2} D_t \phi| \lesssim |D_X^{\tilde{K}_1} D_Y^{K_2} D_t^2 \phi| \\ + \sum_{\substack{|I_1|+|I_2|=|K_2|-1 \\ X \in \{\partial_\alpha\} \\ Y_1, Y_2, Z \in \{\partial_i\}}} |D_X^{\tilde{K}_1} D_{Y_1}^{I_1} [D_t, D_Z] D_{Y_2}^{I_2} D_t \phi| ,$$

where this time $|\tilde{K}_1| = |K_1| - 1$ and $\tilde{K}_1^0 = l - 2$. Notice that these numerical conditions guarantee that no more than a total of $k - 1$ derivatives altogether, and no more than $l - 1$ of the D_t derivatives in particular, can fall on ϕ in this second term. Therefore, we are again left with estimating terms which are similar to those appearing on the right hand side of (8.29) above.

Finally, to deal with the first term on the right hand side of (8.30) we simply use the wave equation (1.2) which trades the derivatives D_t^2 for the covariant Laplacian $D^i D_i$. Having reduced the total number of time derivatives in this last expression we are done by induction. This completes the proof of the estimate (8.21). $\square$

9. DIFFERENTIATING THE EQUATIONS II: ERROR ESTIMATES FOR THE COMPLEX SCALAR FIELD ϕ

To wrap things up, we need to prove the boot-strapping estimate (8.3) for the ϕ portion of things. Using the energy estimate (4.19) for complex scalar fields, and using the assumption that $C_{k,s,\gamma,\epsilon}^{-1}$ in (8.4) is chosen so small that the L^∞ norm term on the right hand side of (4.19) can be absorbed into the right hand side of that inequality, and using the estimates (6.7) and (8.26) above to deal with the terms involving the initial data we see that it is enough to prove the following L^2 estimate for the commutator of covariant derivatives and the complex D'Lambertian:

Proposition 9.1 (Error bounds for the complex scalar field ϕ). *Let k be a given level of regularity, and assume that we are given parameters $0 < s, \gamma, \epsilon$ with the properties that $s \leq 1$, and $2\epsilon \leq s - \frac{1}{2}$, and $s + \gamma < \frac{3}{2}$. Let $0 < T$ be a given time value. Then there exists a constant $1 \leq C_{k,s,\gamma,\epsilon}$ depending only on k, s, ϵ, γ , such that if:*

$$(9.1) \quad E_2^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0, T)[\Psi] \leq C_{k,s,\gamma,\epsilon}^{-1} ,$$

then one has the following weighted space-time estimate for commutators:

$$(9.2) \quad \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_+^s \tau_-^{\frac{1}{2}}(w)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\gamma,\epsilon} [\square^C, D_X^I] \phi\|_{L^2[0,T]} \lesssim \sum_{l=2}^7 \left[E_k^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0, T)[\Psi] \right]^l ,$$

where $w_{\gamma,\epsilon}$ is the weight function from line (3.16) above.

Proof of estimate (9.2). As in the previous section, we may assume that $C_{k,s,\gamma,\epsilon}^{-1}$ is chosen small enough that the right hand side of (7.6) containing the extra L^∞ norm can be absorbed into the left hand side. Taking this into account, it suffices to be able to show:

$$(9.3) \quad \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} \|\tau_+^s \tau_-^{\frac{1}{2}}(w)_{\gamma,\epsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}} [\square^{\mathbb{C}}, D_X^I] \phi\|_{L^2[0,T]} \lesssim \\ E_k^{(s,\gamma,\epsilon)}(0,T)[\Psi] \cdot ||| \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{k-2} \Psi |||_{L^\infty[0,T](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2 \left(1 + ||| \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{k-2} \Psi |||_{L^\infty[0,T](s,\gamma,\epsilon)}^2\right)^2.$$

Our first step in this process is to expand the commutator $[\square^{\mathbb{C}}, D_X^I]$. This is done through the following multiindex identity:

$$(9.4) \quad [\square^{\mathbb{C}}, D_X^I] \phi = \sum_{\substack{K_1+K_2+K_3=I \\ |K_2|=1 \\ X_1, X_2, X_3 \in \mathbb{L}}} D_{X_1}^{K_1} [\square^{\mathbb{C}}, D_{X_2}^{K_2}] D_{X_3}^{K_3} \phi.$$

Now, using the single derivative commutator formula (2.17) in conjunction with a repeated application the two identities:

$$\begin{aligned} D_X (Y^\alpha F_{\alpha\beta} D^\beta \phi) &= [X, Y]^\alpha F_{\alpha\beta} D^\beta \phi \\ &+ Y^\alpha \mathcal{L}_X F_{\alpha\beta} D^\beta \phi + Y^\alpha F_{\alpha\beta} D^\beta (D_X \phi) \\ &- Y^\alpha F_{\alpha\beta}^{(X)} \pi^{\beta\gamma} D_\gamma \phi + \sqrt{-1} Y^\alpha F_{\alpha\beta} F_\gamma^\beta X^\gamma \cdot \phi, \end{aligned}$$

and:

$$\begin{aligned} D_X (\nabla^\beta (Y^\alpha F_{\alpha\beta}) \cdot \phi) &= \nabla^\beta ([X, Y]^\alpha F_{\alpha\beta}) \cdot \phi + \nabla^\beta (Y^\alpha \mathcal{L}_X F_{\alpha\beta}) \cdot \phi \\ &+ \nabla^\beta (Y^\alpha F_{\alpha\beta}) \cdot D_X \phi - {}^{(X)}\pi^{\beta\gamma} \nabla_\gamma (Y^\alpha F_{\alpha\beta}) \cdot \phi, \end{aligned}$$

which in turn follow from the geometric formulas (2.4), (2.11), (2.16), (2.14), and (2.9) (respectively), we arrive at the following point-wise bound for the left hand side of (9.4) above:

$$\begin{aligned} (9.5) \quad & \sum_{\substack{|I| \leq k \\ X \in \mathbb{L}}} |[\square^{\mathbb{C}}, D_X^I] \phi|, \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|K_1|+|K_2| \leq k-1 \\ X_1, X_2, Y \in \mathbb{L}}} \left(|Y^\beta (\mathcal{L}_{X_1}^{K_1} J_\beta)| \cdot |D_{X_2}^{K_2} \phi| \right. \\ & \quad \left. + |2Y^\alpha (\mathcal{L}_{X_1}^{K_1} F_{\alpha\beta}) \cdot D^\beta (D_{X_2}^{K_2} \phi) - \nabla^\alpha (Y^\beta) \cdot (\mathcal{L}_{X_1}^{K_1} F_{\alpha\beta}) \cdot (D_{X_2}^{K_2} \phi)| \right) \\ & \quad + \sum_{\substack{|K_1|+|K_2|+|K_3| \leq k-2 \\ X_1, X_2, X_3, Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathbb{L}}} |Y_1^\alpha (\mathcal{L}_{X_1}^{K_1} F_{\alpha\beta})| \cdot |Y_2^\gamma (\mathcal{L}_{X_2}^{K_2} F_\gamma^\beta)| \cdot |D_{X_3}^{K_3} \phi|, \\ & = A + B + C. \end{aligned}$$

Our goal is now to prove the bound (9.3) for each of these three terms. We do this separately and in order. As with the proof of (8.7)–(8.9) above, we will only carry out our calculations in the region $t < 2r$ as the calculations necessary to handle

the region $r < \frac{1}{2}t$ are essentially trivial because all components of $(F, D\phi)$ can be treated on an equal footing there.

Our first step is to deal with the A term above. Taking in to account the abstract parity estimates (7.21)–(7.22), our task is reduced to showing the symbolic bound:

$$(9.6) \quad A \lesssim \sum_{\substack{l+m=k-1 \\ a+b+c+d=0}} \tau_+^{-1} \tau_{(a)} \tau_{(b)} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l \Psi_{(c)} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l Q_{(c)} \right) \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^m \Psi_{(d)} \cdot \left(1 + \|\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{k-2} \Psi\|_{L^\infty[0,T](s,\gamma,\epsilon)} \right)^2.$$

Expanding out the contraction with respect to β in the first factor of the A term, and using the identifications (8.19) we have the straight forward bound:

$$(9.7) \quad |Y^\beta \mathcal{L}_{X_1}^{K_1} J_\beta| \lesssim \sum_{a+b=0} \tau_{(a)} |\mathcal{L}_{X_1}^{K_1} J_{(b)}|.$$

To bound the $\mathcal{L}_{X_1}^{K_1} J_{(b)}$ term itself, we can simply use lines (8.7)–(8.9) above. However, it will be necessary for us to use the following refinement of those bounds, which can easily be checked by recalling lines (8.11)–(8.15):

$$\sum_{\substack{|K_1| \leq l \\ X_1 \in \mathbb{L}}} |\mathcal{L}_{X_1}^{K_1} J_{(b)}| \lesssim \sum_{\substack{c+d=b \\ l_1+l_2=l}} \tau_+^{-1} \tau_{(c)} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{l_1} \Psi_{(d)} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{l_1} Q_{(d)} \right) \cdot \sum_{\substack{|K_1| \leq l_2 \\ X_1 \in \mathbb{L}}} |D_{X_1}^{K_1} \phi| \cdot \left(1 + \|\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{l-2} \Psi\|_{L^\infty[0,T](s,\gamma,\epsilon)} \right).$$

Expanding this into (9.7) above, and tacking on the extra factor of $D_{X_2}^{K_2} \phi$ while using the bound:

$$\sum_{\substack{|K_1| \leq l_2, |K_2| \leq m \\ l_2+m \leq k-1 \\ X_1, X_2 \in \mathbb{L}}} |D_{X_1}^{K_1} \phi| \cdot |D_{X_2}^{K_2} \phi| \lesssim \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{\max\{l_2, m\}} \Psi_{(0)} \cdot \|\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{k-2} \Psi\|_{L^\infty[0,T](s,\gamma,\epsilon)},$$

noting that by design we have $l_1 + \max\{l_2, m\} \leq k-1$, we see that we have achieved (9.6). Notice that here we are making (crucial) use of the special bound $|D_X^I \phi| \lesssim \tau_+^{-1}$, when $|I| \leq k-1$, contained in the norm (7.4).

We now move on to bounding the B term in line (9.5) above. Here we will prove the symbolic bound:

$$(9.8) \quad B \lesssim \sum_{\substack{a+b+c=0 \\ l+m \leq k-1}} \tau_{(a)} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l \Psi_{(b)} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l Q_{(b)} \right) \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^m \Psi_{(c)}.$$

Through an application of estimate (7.21), this will prove the bound (9.3) for the B portion of things. To simplify matters, it suffices to prove the above bound with $l = m = 0$. The same estimate containing derivatives is simply a matter of

notation. With this in mind, it suffices to show that both:

$$(9.9) \quad \left| Y^\alpha(F_{\alpha\beta}) \cdot \frac{1}{r} D^\beta(r\phi) \right| \lesssim \sum_{a+b+c=0} \tau_{(a)} (Q_{(b)} + \Psi_{(b)}) \cdot \Psi_{(c)} ,$$

$$(9.10) \quad \left| \left(\frac{2}{r} \nabla^\alpha(r) \cdot X^\beta - \nabla^\alpha(X^\beta) \right) \cdot F_{\alpha\beta} \right| \cdot |\phi| \lesssim \sum_{a+b+c=0} \tau_{(a)} (Q_{(b)} + \Psi_{(b)}) \cdot \Psi_{(c)} .$$

Notice that the proof (9.9) is a simple matter of applying the definitions (7.1), (7.20), and the weight bounds (8.14). The key observation here is that since this is a full contraction, its parity weight must be zero. Also, note that the term $\frac{1}{r} D_\perp(r\phi)$ can be treated as a $\Psi_{(-1)}$ term on account of the symbolic bounds (i.e. any bound for the right hand side is satisfied by the left hand side):

$$\Psi_{(0)} \lesssim \Psi_{(-1)} .$$

Therefore, to prove (9.8) it now remains to show the bounds (9.10). For the most part this is a simple matter of noticing that from the formulas (2.34) (or by homogeneity!), each component of the covariant derivatives on the left hand side of (9.10) satisfies the bounds:

$$\left| \frac{2}{r} \nabla^\alpha(r) \cdot X^\beta \right| + \left| \nabla^\alpha X^\beta \right| \lesssim 1 .$$

Thus, if the parity weight of $F_{\alpha\beta}$ is (0) or (1) we can pass to the right hand side of (9.10) after multiplication by the bounded factor $\tau_+ \cdot r^{-1}$. The only case where this general procedure does not work is when $F_{\alpha\beta}$ has weight (-1) . In this case, to pass to the right hand side of (9.10) we must pick up an extra factor of τ_0 . This indeed turns out to be the case, and is perhaps the most striking structural property of the commutator (2.17) as was pointed out in [15] (see p. 226 of that work) in a somewhat different form. What we need to show is that:

$$(9.11) \quad \left| \frac{2}{r} \nabla^L(r) \cdot X^A - \nabla^L(X^A) + \nabla^A(X^L) \right| \lesssim \tau_0 ,$$

for each $X \in \mathbb{L}$ in the region $t < 2r$. This follows from a direct use of the identities (2.34). Notice that for the case $X \in \{\partial_\alpha, S\}$, the above sum either vanishes or is of the order $O(r^{-1})$. Thus, the main thing to check is that (9.11) holds when $X \in \{\Omega_{ij}, \Omega_{i0}\}$. This in turn follows easily from the formulas:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^L(\Omega_{ij}^A) &= -\frac{1}{2r} \Omega_{ij}^A , & \nabla^A(\Omega_{ij}^L) &= \frac{1}{2r} \Omega_{ij}^A , \\ \nabla^L(\Omega_{i0}^A) &= -\frac{1}{2} \omega_i^A , & \nabla^A(\Omega_{i0}^L) &= \frac{1}{2} \omega_i^A . \end{aligned}$$

To finish our proof of estimate (9.3), we only need to show this bound for the C term on line (9.5) above. Writing $F = \tilde{F} + \bar{F}$ and expanding out this term into

parity notation, we have the symbolic bound:

$$\begin{aligned}
C &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{l+m=k-2 \\ a+b+c+d=0}} \tau_+^{-1} \tau_{(a)} \tau_{(b)} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l \Psi_{(c)} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l Q_{(c)} \right) \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^m \Psi_{(d)} \cdot ||| \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{k-2} \Psi |||_{L^\infty[0,T](s,\gamma,\epsilon)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{l+m=k-2 \\ a+b+c+d=0}} \tau_+ \tau_{(a)} \tau_{(b)} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l Q_{(c)} \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^m Q_{(d)} \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{k-2} \Psi_{(0)} , \\
&= C_1 + C_2 .
\end{aligned}$$

To prove the bound (9.3) for the term C_1 is a simple matter of referring to the abstract parity estimate (7.21). Thus, we are left with bounding the term C_2 . This reduces directly to a special case of the estimate (7.22) after an application of the L^∞ bound (7.7) which easily implies that there exists a cutoff function $\tilde{\chi}^+$ such that:

$$\sum_{\substack{l+m=k-2 \\ a+b+c+d=0}} \tau_+ \tau_{(a)} \tau_{(b)} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^l Q_{(c)} \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^m Q_{(d)} \lesssim \tau_+ \cdot |q| \frac{\tilde{\chi}^+(r-t-2)}{r^2} \cdot |q| .$$

Notice that the right hand side of this last line behaves the same in estimate (7.22) as the expression:

$$\tau_+^{-1} \tau_{(0)} \tau_{(0)} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{k-2} Q_{(0)} \cdot ||| \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{k-2} \Psi |||_{L^\infty[0,T](s,\gamma,\epsilon)} .$$

Multiplying this by the factor $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}^{k-2} \Psi_{(0)}$ and then substituting the result into left hand side of (9.3), we are done by an application of the parity estimate (7.21). This completes the proof of (9.2). $\square$

10. APPENDIX

This appendix contains the proofs of several more or less standard weighted Sobolev type estimates which are used at various places in the main paper. In particular in Sections 3 and 5–6. We make no claim of originality here, rather our purpose is to have things stated in the precise form in which we find them convenient to use in our work. The first such estimate is a simple weighted version of the usual $L^2 \hookrightarrow L^6$ embedding:

Lemma 10.1. *Let φ be a real valued test function on $\mathbb{R}^3$, and set:*

$$(10.1) \quad q = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \varphi \, dx ,$$

the average of φ . Let δ be given such that $\frac{1}{2} < \delta < \frac{3}{2}$. Then the following weighted integral inequality holds:

$$(10.2) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} r^{2\delta} \left| \nabla \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} \varphi + \frac{q}{4\pi r} \right) \right|^2 dx \lesssim \| r^\delta \varphi \|_{L^{\frac{6}{5}}}^2 .$$

In the above estimate, the implicit constants depend on δ .

Remark 10.2. In effect, what estimate (10.2) shows is that is possible to commute the weight r^δ past the Riesz operator $\nabla\Delta^{-1}$ so long as one first subtracts off the leading order term in the asymptotic expansion of $\Delta^{-1}\varphi$. This is:

$$(10.3) \quad \nabla_i \frac{1}{\Delta} \varphi \sim \frac{q \cdot \omega_i}{4\pi r^2} .$$

That such a correction is necessary is clear from the range of weights we are considering because for $\frac{1}{2} < \delta$ a function with this asymptotic behavior at infinity cannot be in L^2 weighted by r^δ . The idea behind (10.2) is, of course, that once the right hand side of (10.3) is subtracted off from $\nabla\Delta^{-1}\varphi$ the resulting function will decay enough to be in r^δ weighted L^2 as long as the appropriately weighted $L^{\frac{6}{5}}$ norm of φ is bounded. However, there is a limit to how much weight one can expect to apply this way. This is because one can further expand (10.3) to include higher order terms:

$$(10.4) \quad \nabla_i \frac{1}{\Delta} \varphi \sim - \nabla_i \left(\frac{q}{4\pi r} + \sum_k \frac{q_k \cdot \omega_k}{4\pi r^2} + \{higher\} \right) ,$$

where:

$$q_k = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} y_k \varphi(y) dy ,$$

are the higher moments of φ . Without the additional vanishing of these other quantities, it is clear that one cannot put $r^\delta \nabla\Delta^{-1}\varphi$ in L^2 for $\frac{3}{2} \leq \delta$. (10.4) is sometimes referred to as the *multipole* expansion of $\nabla\frac{1}{\Delta}\varphi$. Since we are only interested in the decay of the initial data (1.18) modulo charge of the order no greater than $O(r^{-3})$, the first term in (10.4) will be the only one which concerns us in this work.

Proof of (10.2). Our first step here is to simply integrate by parts several times on the left hand side of (10.2). This yields the identity:

$$(10.5) \quad (\text{L.H.S.})(10.2) = \delta(2\delta+1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} r^{2\delta-2} \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} \varphi + \frac{q}{4\pi r} \right)^2 dx \\ - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} r^{2\delta} \varphi \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} \varphi + \frac{q}{4\pi r} \right) dx .$$

To bound the integral in the first term on the right hand side of (10.5) above, we use the definition (10.1) to compute:

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} r^{2\delta-2} \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} \varphi + \frac{q}{4\pi r} \right)^2 dx \right| \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} r^{2\delta-2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left| \frac{1}{|x-y|} - \frac{1}{|y|} \right| |\varphi(y)| dy \right)^2 dx .$$

We now split cases depending on whether $\frac{1}{2} < \delta \leq 1$ or $1 < \delta < \frac{3}{2}$. In the first case we use the bound:

$$\left| \frac{1}{|x-y|} - \frac{1}{|y|} \right| \lesssim |y|^\delta \left(\frac{1}{|x|^\delta |x-y|} + \frac{1}{|x| |x-y|^\delta} \right) .$$

This reduces our work to estimating the two integrals:

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{|x|^2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{|x-y|} |y|^\delta |\varphi(y)| dy \right)^2 dx, \quad \frac{1}{2} < \delta \leq 1, \\ B &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{|x|^{4-2\delta}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{|x-y|^\delta} |y|^\delta |\varphi(y)| dy \right)^2 dx, \quad \frac{1}{2} < \delta \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

In the second case, we simply use the bound:

$$\left| \frac{1}{|x-y|} - \frac{1}{|y|} \right| \leq \frac{|y|}{|x||x-y|}.$$

This reduces us to bounding the integral:

$$C = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{|x|^{4-2\delta}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{|x-y||y|^{\delta-1}} |y|^\delta |\varphi(y)| dy \right)^2 dx, \quad 1 < \delta < \frac{3}{2}.$$

In all cases, the bound we wish to prove is:

$$(10.6) \quad A, B, C, \lesssim \|r^\delta \varphi\|_{L^{\frac{6}{5}}}.$$

This last estimate follows from several different instances of the generalized fractional integration Lemma 10.3 below. Notice that in the case of integral A we have (notation of Lemma 10.3) $\alpha = \beta = 1$, and $\gamma = 0$. In case of integral B we have $\alpha = 2 - \delta$, $\beta = \delta$, and $\gamma = 0$. In the case of integral C above we have $\alpha = 2 - \delta$, $\beta = 1$, and $\gamma = \delta - 1$. In all cases we have that $p = p' = 2$ and $q = \frac{6}{5}$ and $\alpha + \beta + \gamma = 2$ so the scaling condition (10.10) is satisfied. Also, note that in each case we have that $\alpha < \frac{3}{2}$ and $\gamma < \frac{1}{2}$ so the “gap” condition (10.11) is satisfied. This completes the proof of the bound:

$$(10.7) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} r^{2\delta-2} \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} \varphi + \frac{q}{4\pi r} \right)^2 dx \right| \lesssim \|r^\delta \varphi\|_{L^{\frac{6}{5}}}.$$

It remains to bound the second term on the right hand side expression (10.5) above. By Hölders inequality we have that:

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} r^{2\delta} \varphi \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} \varphi + \frac{q}{4\pi r} \right) dx \right| \leq \|r^\delta \varphi\|_{L^{\frac{6}{5}}} \cdot \|r^\delta \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} \varphi + \frac{q}{4\pi r} \right)\|_{L^6}.$$

By the usual $L^2 \hookrightarrow L^6$ Sobolev embedding, the Leibnitz rule, and the triangle inequality, the second factor on the right hand side above can be bounded by:

$$\|r^\delta \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} \varphi + \frac{q}{4\pi r} \right)\|_{L^6} \lesssim \|r^{\delta-1} \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} \varphi + \frac{q}{4\pi r} \right)\|_{L^2} + \|r^\delta \nabla \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} \varphi + \frac{q}{4\pi r} \right)\|_{L^2}.$$

Therefore, using the bound (10.7) above, we can estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} (10.8) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} r^{2\delta} \varphi \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} \varphi + \frac{q}{4\pi r} \right) dx \right| \\ \lesssim \|r^\delta \varphi\|_{L^{\frac{6}{5}}} \cdot \left(\|r^\delta \varphi\|_{L^{\frac{6}{5}}} + \|r^\delta \nabla \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} \varphi + \frac{q}{4\pi r} \right)\|_{L^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Adding estimates (10.7) and (10.8) into the identity (10.5), dividing through by the quantity $\|r^\delta \nabla \left(\frac{1}{\Delta} \varphi + \frac{q}{4\pi r} \right)\|_{L^2}$ and resquaring, we have achieved the desired estimate (10.2). $\square$

To complete the proof of (10.2), we need to show the bound (10.6) for the integrals A, B , and C above. This will be a consequence of the following generalization of the classical Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev fractional integration theorem (see [11]):

Lemma 10.3 (General fractional integration lemma). *Let $1 < q < p < \infty$ and $0 \leq \alpha, \beta, \gamma$ be given parameters. Then the following integral estimate holds for (positive) test functions F and G on $\mathbb{R}^3$:*

$$(10.9) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} G(x) \frac{1}{|x|^\alpha |x-y|^\beta |y|^\gamma} F(y) \, dx dy \lesssim \|G\|_{L^{p'}} \cdot \|F\|_{L^q},$$

where the following conditions hold on the various indices:

$$(10.10) \quad 3 - (\alpha + \beta + \gamma) = 3\left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p}\right), \quad (\text{scaling}),$$

$$(10.11) \quad \alpha < 3\left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right), \quad \gamma < 3\left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right), \quad (\text{“gap”}).$$

The implicit constant in the above estimate depends on $p, q, \alpha, \beta, \gamma$.

Proof of (10.9). By the restricted weak type version of the Marcinkiewicz interpolation theorem, it suffices to prove that:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \chi_E(x) \frac{1}{|x|^\alpha |x-y|^\beta |y|^\gamma} \chi_F(y) \, dx dy \lesssim |E|^{\frac{1}{p'}} \cdot |F|^{\frac{1}{q}},$$

for measurable sets E and F where $1 < q < p < \infty$ and the conditions (10.10)–(10.11) hold. By the Riesz rearrangement inequality (see [11]) this is further reduced to showing that:

$$(10.12) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\chi_E(x) \cdot |x|^{-\alpha})^* \frac{1}{|x-y|^\beta} (\chi_F(y) \cdot |y|^{-\gamma})^* \, dx dy \lesssim |E|^{\frac{1}{p'}} \cdot |F|^{\frac{1}{q}},$$

where f^* denotes the symmetric decreasing rearrangement¹⁴ of the function f . We now compute that:

$$\begin{aligned} (\chi_E(x) \cdot |x|^{-\alpha})^*(r) &= \int_0^\infty \chi_{\{\chi_E \cdot |x|^{-\alpha} > s\}}^*(r) \, ds, \\ &= \int_0^\infty \chi_{[0, |E \cap B(s^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}})|^{\frac{1}{3}})}(r) \, ds, \\ &\leq \chi_{[0, |E|^{\frac{1}{3}})}(r) \cdot \int_0^\infty \chi_{[0, 4\pi s^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}})}(r) \, ds, \\ &= (4\pi)^{-1} (\chi_E)^*(r) \cdot r^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for $(\chi_F(x) \cdot |x|^{-\gamma})^*$. We now plug these formulas into the right hand side of (10.12) and apply the usual fractional integration theorem to yield:

$$\begin{aligned} (10.13) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\chi_E(x))^* \cdot |x|^{-\alpha} \frac{1}{|x-y|^\beta} (\chi_F(y))^* \cdot |y|^{-\gamma} \, dx dy \\ \lesssim \|(\chi_E(x))^* \cdot |x|^{-\alpha}\|_{L^{\theta_1}} \cdot \|(\chi_F(y))^* \cdot |y|^{-\gamma}\|_{L^{\theta_2}}, \end{aligned}$$

¹⁴Here we use a definition of f^* which does not include the usual normalization factor of 4π to avoid additional typesetting. This is $\chi_E^*(r) = \chi_{[0, |E|^{\frac{1}{3}})}(r)$. Clearly this convention does not effect the use of rearrangements in the Riesz inequality.

where we choose θ_1 and θ_2 to be given by the expressions $\frac{1}{\theta_1} = \frac{1}{p'} + \frac{\alpha}{3}$ and $\frac{1}{\theta_2} = \frac{1}{q} + \frac{\gamma}{3}$ respectively. Notice that from the scaling condition (10.10) and some quick algebra we have that: $6 - \beta = 3(\frac{1}{\theta_1} + \frac{1}{\theta_2})$, which is the scaling condition needed for (10.13) to hold. Furthermore, notice that by the gap condition (10.11) we have that both $1 < \theta_1, \theta_2 < \infty$ which is also needed for (10.13) to hold. The proof of (10.12) is now accomplished by simply computing:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\chi_E(x))^* \cdot |x|^{-\alpha}\|_{L^{\theta_1}}^{p'} &= \left(\int_0^{|E|^{\frac{1}{3}}} r^{2-\alpha\theta_1} dr \right)^{\frac{p'}{\theta_1}}, \\ &\lesssim |E|^{\frac{p'}{3\theta_1}(3-\alpha\theta_1)}, \\ &= |E|. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the inequality follows because we automatically have that $\alpha\theta_1 < 3$. An identical computation shows that:

$$\|(\chi_F(x))^* \cdot |x|^{-\gamma}\|_{L^{\theta_2}}^q \lesssim |F|.$$

This completes the proof of (10.12) and therefore the proof of estimate (10.9). $\square$

The second main set of estimates we prove here are a localized version of the so called global Sobolev inequalities. These were first utilized in [8] to prove global existence and asymptotic behavior for general non-linear wave equations. The versions which we state here are sufficiently “atomic” to provide all of the L^∞ we will need in this paper. To discuss these, we shall employ the same notation as introduced in the beginning of Section 5. In particular, the notion of a dyadic cone distance (CD) shell and the associated $\tau_+(\mathcal{J}), \tau_-(\mathcal{J})$ notation.

Lemma 10.4 (Exterior global Sobolev estimate). *In the exterior region $1 \leq t < 2r$ let $\mathcal{J}$ be a given dyadic CD shell, and let q be given such that $2 < q < \infty$. Then for test functions f the following estimates hold:*

$$(10.14) \quad \sup_{\omega} |\chi f(t, r, \omega)| \lesssim \tau_+^{-\frac{2}{q}}(\mathcal{J}) \sum_{i < j} \|\Omega_{ij} \chi f(t, r, \cdot)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{S}_r^2)},$$

where χ is the cutoff on the dyadic CD shell $\mathcal{J}$. Furthermore, in the case where $2 \leq q < 4$ we also have the estimate:

$$(10.15) \quad \|\chi f\|_{L_r^\infty(L^q(\mathbb{S}_r^2))} \lesssim \tau_+^{-2(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q})}(\mathcal{J}) \tau_-^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{J}) \left(\|\chi f\|_{L^2} + \|\tau_- \partial_r \chi f\|_{L^2} + \sum_{i < j} \|\Omega_{ij} \chi f\|_{L^2} \right).$$

Proof of estimates (10.14)–(10.15). The proof of both of these is entirely standard as they are essentially just rescaled versions of the usual translation invariant Sobolev estimates. For example, (10.14) is just the Sobolev theorem on spheres $\mathbb{S}_r$. For the sake of completeness we give here a proof of (10.15).

The first step is to introduce a new set of variables which we denote by $(\tilde{r}, \omega)$ and are supported in the unit dyadic annular region $\mathcal{A} = [\frac{1}{8}, 8] \times \mathbb{S}^2$ (where $\mathbb{S}^2$ without a

subscript denotes the unit sphere), and which satisfy the change of variable formula:

$$(\tau_-(\mathcal{J}) \cdot \tilde{r} + t, r \cdot \omega) = (r, \omega_r) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}_r^2 .$$

That is, we rescale the standard radial variable around the point $r = t$ by the factor $\tau_-(\mathcal{J})$ and we rescale the angular variable by the factor of r . This procedure gives the change of volume formula:

$$(10.16) \quad dr d\omega_r = v(r) \cdot d\tilde{r} d\omega , \quad v(r) \sim \tau_+^2(\mathcal{J}) \cdot \tau_-(\mathcal{J}) ,$$

where the comparison on the right hand side above holds in the region $x \in \mathcal{J}$. Using the analog of (10.16) for integration on a fixed sphere we have the equivalence:

$$\|\chi f\|_{L_r^\infty(L^q(\mathbb{S}_r^2))} \sim \tau_+^{\frac{2}{q}}(\mathcal{J}) \cdot \|\chi f\|_{L_r^\infty(L^q(\mathbb{S}^2))} .$$

Furthermore, a direct calculation using (10.16) gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_+(\mathcal{J})\tau_-^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{J}) \cdot \left(\|\chi f\|_{L^2} + \sum_{i < j} \|\Omega_{ij} \chi f\|_{L^2} + \|\tau_- \partial_r \chi f\|_{L^2} \right) \sim \\ \|\chi f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{A})} + \|\partial_{\tilde{r}} \chi f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{A})} + \|\nabla \chi f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{A})} . \end{aligned}$$

Using these last two expressions in tandem we see that the proof of (10.15) reduces to being able to show that:

$$(10.17) \quad \|\chi f\|_{L_r^\infty(L^q(\mathbb{S}^2))} \lesssim \|\chi f\|_{H^1(\mathcal{A})} .$$

Notice that by design, the rescaled χf does not intersect the boundary $\partial\mathcal{A}$. Using two charts on the interior of $\mathcal{A}$, estimate (10.17) follows from the general mixed Sobolev embedding on $\mathbb{R}^3$ for test functions φ :

$$(10.18) \quad \|\varphi\|_{L_x^p(L_y^q)} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{H^1} ,$$

where $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{p} - \frac{2}{q} < 1$. This last estimate in turn follows from running the Sobolev lemma in the x and y variables separately to achieve:

$$\|\varphi\|_{L_x^p(L_y^q)} \lesssim \|\langle D_x \rangle^{(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p})+} \langle D_y \rangle^{2(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q})} \varphi\|_{L^2} .$$

where the “+” notation denotes an arbitrarily small positive constant which gets us around the case $p = \infty$. (10.18) now follows from this last estimate and the symbol bounds:

$$(1 + |\xi_x|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p})+} (1 + |\xi_y|^2)^{(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q})} \lesssim (1 + |\xi_x|^2 + |\xi_y|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} ,$$

whenever $\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{p} - \frac{2}{q} < 1$. We have now shown (10.15). $\square$

The second global Sobolev estimate we prove here is the analog of Lemma 10.4 for the interior region $r < \frac{1}{2}t$. This is:

Lemma 10.5 (Interior global Sobolev estimate). *Fix $1 \leq t$, then in the interior region $r < \frac{3}{4}t$ one has the following weighted estimate for compactly supported (in that region) test functions f :*

$$(10.19) \quad \|f\|_{L^q} \lesssim t^{-3(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q})} \left(\|f\|_{L^p} + \sum_{X \in \{S, \Omega_{0i}\}} \|X(f)\|_{L^p} \right) ,$$

whenever $\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} < \frac{1}{3}$.

Proof of estimate (10.19). Note that this estimate is taking place in a ball of radius t . By simply rescaling the usual Sobolev estimate we have that:

$$\|f\|_{L^q} \lesssim t^{-3(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q})} (\|f\|_{L^p} + t \|\nabla f\|_{L^p}) .$$

Therefore, the desired result follows directly from the bound:

$$t \|\nabla f\|_{L^p} \lesssim \sum_{X \in \{S, \Omega_{0i}\}} \|X(f)\|_{L^p} ,$$

which in turn follows from the identities:

$$\begin{aligned} t \partial_i &= \Omega_{i0} - x_i \partial_t , \\ \partial_t &= (t^2 - r^2)^{-1} (tS - x^i \Omega_{i0}) . \end{aligned}$$

□

Finally, we end this appendix with a characteristic version of the exterior estimates (10.14)–(10.15). This will be used to prove the peeling properties of the best decaying components of F and ϕ in the main part of the paper. Although strictly speaking it is not necessary for our proof, we would like to know that these good decay estimates hold a-priori at each fixed time, without having to assume that the solution to (1.17) satisfies appropriate global decay estimates. Because of this we will need to cut the characteristic estimate off sharply inside the time slabs $1 \leq t \leq t_0$.

Lemma 10.6 (Characteristic (truncated) global Sobolev estimate). *Let $C(u)$ denote the cones $u = \text{const.}$ and let t_0 be a fixed parameter. Now define the truncated cone:*

$$\overline{C}(u) = C(u) \cap \{1 \leq t \leq t_0\} \cap \{t < 2r\} ,$$

Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a dyadic shell along the extended exterior region $t < 2r$ of the cone $C(u)$, and χ its smooth cutoff. Then for any test function f one has the following estimate for $2 < q < \infty$:

$$(10.20) \quad \sup_{\omega} |\chi f(t, r, \omega)| \lesssim \tau_+^{-\frac{2}{q}}(\mathcal{I}) \sum_{i < j} \|\Omega_{ij} \chi f(t, r, \cdot)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{S}_r^2)} .$$

Furthermore, in the case where $2 \leq q < 4$ we also have the estimate:

$$(10.21) \quad \|\chi f\|_{L_u^\infty(L^q(\mathbb{S}_r^2)(\overline{C}(u)))} \lesssim \tau_+^{-\frac{3}{2}-\frac{2}{q}}(\mathcal{I}) \left(\|\chi f\|_{L^2(\overline{C}(u))} + \|\underline{u} L(\chi f)\|_{L^2(\overline{C}(u))} + \sum_{i < j} \|\Omega_{ij}(\chi f)\|_{L^2(\overline{C}(u))} \right) .$$

Proof of estimates (10.20)–(10.21). The first estimate (10.20) is of course just a restatement of (10.14). Therefore, we concentrate on (10.21). This estimate is proved using the same steps for (10.15) above, that is through a rescaling argument followed by the mixed norm Sobolev estimate (10.18). However, we need to take a little care to deal with the sharp cutoff inside the slab $\{1 \leq t \leq t_0\}$. This is done by utilizing an extension argument for H^1 functions (see [18]).

The details are as follows. We first rescale all variables along the cone $\chi\overline{C}(u)$ by the factor $\tau_+(\mathcal{I})$. Doing this, we are again reduced to showing the annular estimate (10.17). However, this time it is possible for χf to extend past the boundary $\partial\mathcal{A}$ even though we are only allowed to estimate its behavior inside the region $\mathcal{A}$. We get around this problem by using the fact that $\mathcal{A}$ is a C^∞ submanifold with boundary of $\mathbb{R}^3$, which allows us to extend $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}\chi f$ to a function $\tilde{f}$ with the properties:

$$\tilde{f}|_{\mathcal{A}} = \chi f|_{\mathcal{A}}, \quad \|\tilde{f}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim \|\chi f\|_{H^1(\mathcal{A})}.$$

Applying estimate (10.18) to the function $\tilde{f}$ and using this last bound yields the desired result. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] Christodoulou, D. *Global solutions of nonlinear hyperbolic equations for small initial data*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **39** (1986), no. 2, 267–282.
- [2] Choquet-Bruhat, Yvonne; Christodoulou, Demetrios *Existence of global solutions of the Yang-Mills, Higgs and spinor field equations in 3 + 1 dimensions*. Ann. Sci. cole Norm. Sup. (4) **14** (1981), no. 4, 481–506 (1982).
- [3] Christodoulou, D.; Klainerman, S. *Asymptotic properties of linear field equations in Minkowski space*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **43** (1990), no. 2, 137–199.
- [4] Christodoulou, D.; Klainerman, S. *The global non-linear stability of Minkowski Space*. Princeton Mathematical Series, **41**. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993. x+514 pp.
- [5] Eardley, Douglas M.; Moncrief, Vincent *The global existence of Yang-Mills-Higgs fields in 4-dimensional Minkowski space. I. Local existence and smoothness properties*. Comm. Math. Phys. **83** (1982), no. 2, 171–191.
- [6] Eardley, Douglas M.; Moncrief, Vincent *The global existence of Yang-Mills-Higgs fields in 4-dimensional Minkowski space. II. Completion of proof*. Comm. Math. Phys. **83** (1982), no. 2, 193–212.
- [7] Flato, Moshé; Simon, Jacques C. H.; Taflin, Erik *Asymptotic completeness, global existence and the infrared problem for the Maxwell-Dirac equations*. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **127** (1997), no. 606, x+311 pp.
- [8] Klainerman, Sergiu *Uniform decay estimates and the Lorentz invariance of the classical wave equation*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **38** (1985), no. 3, 321–332.
- [9] Klainerman, S.; Machedon, M. *On the Maxwell-Klein-Gordon equation with finite energy*. Duke Math. J. **74** (1994), no. 1, 19–44.
- [10] Klainerman, S.; Machedon, M. *Finite energy solutions of the Yang-Mills equations in $\mathbb{R}^{3+1}$* . Ann. of Math. (2) **142** (1995), no. 1, 39–119.
- [11] Lieb, Elliott H.; Loss, Michael *Analysis*. Second edition. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, **14**. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001. xxii+346 pp.
- [12] Lindblad, Hans ; Rodnianski, Igor *Global existence for the Einstein vacuum equations in wave coordinates*. to appear Comm. Math. Phys.
- [13] Morawetz, Cathleen S. *The limiting amplitude principle*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **15** 1962 349–361.
- [14] Psarelli, Maria *Asymptotic behavior of the solutions of Maxwell-Klein-Gordon field equations in 4-dimensional Minkowski space*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations **24** (1999), no. 1-2, 223–272.
- [15] Shu, Wei-Tong *Global existence of Maxwell-Higgs fields*. Nonlinear hyperbolic equations and field theory (Lake Como, 1990), 214–227, Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser., **253**, Longman Sci. Tech., Harlow, 1992.
- [16] Shu, Wei-Tong *Asymptotic properties of the solutions of linear and nonlinear spin field equations in Minkowski space*. Comm. Math. Phys. **140** (1991), no. 3, 449–480.
- [17] Sideris, Thomas C. *Global existence of harmonic maps in Minkowski space*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **42** (1989), no. 1, 1–13.

- [18] Stein, Elias M. *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*. Princeton Mathematical Series, No. **30** Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. 1970 xiv+290 pp.

E-mail address: lindblad@math.ucsd.edu

E-mail address: jsterben@math.ucsd.edu